REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

GEN
ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01735 9792
GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1876,
JUL-OCT

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1876.

VOLUME LVIII.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXVIII.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
NELSON & PHILLIPS.
CINCINNATI: HITCHCOCK & WALDEN.
1876.

I 706211

JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

OBADIAH 389
Rev. Joseph Horner, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.

AN EXTRAORDINARY CHARACTER 416
Rev. Abel Stevens, LL.D., Geneva, Switzerland.

THE MILLENNIUM AND SECOND ADVENT 433
Rev. L. D. Barrows, D.D., Vermont.

OF THE PECULIARITIES OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES 458
Rev. M. J. Cramer, United States Minister to Denmark.

SCHOPENHAUER AND HIS PESSIMISM 487
Rev. Prof. J. P. Lacroix, Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

GOD AND THE WORLD 511
Prof. A. Winchell, LL.D., Syracuse University.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 529

Foreign Religious Intelligence 539

Foreign Literary Intelligence 542

Quarterly Book-Table 545

OCTOBER NUMBER.

RECENT ORIGIN OF MAN [First Article] 581
Edmund Andrews, M.D., Chicago, Illinois.

SYMBOLISM OF THE PRE-CHRISTIAN CROSS 612
John T. Short, Leipzig, Germany.

RELATIONS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH TO THE CAUSE OF TEMPERANCE 628
Rev. Henry Wheeler, Oneonta, N. Y.

GAUTAMA AND LAO-TZU 644
Rev. L. W. Pilcher, B.D., China.

THE COSMIC PHILOSOPHY 655
B. P. Bowne.

THE HISTORY OF PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN INDIA 678
Rev. B. H. Badley, M.A., Gonda, India.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 699

Foreign Religious Intelligence 722

Foreign Literary Intelligence 724

Quarterly Book-Table 727

as against that power if he had possessed knowledge of its greatness and resources. (2 Kings xv, 16.) Even if the reading of the cuneiform inscription on the "Black Obelisk" * is verified, and tribute had been paid by Jehu to Shalmanuber, a century before this, there is no reason why that may not have been the temporary result of a transient raid, soon lost sight of as a matter to cause apprehension, especially as there is no trace of a subsequent continuance of the payment of such tribute. Evincing such lack of knowledge as to the power of the Assyrian monarchy, the conclusion stated seems necessary, that the prophecy must have been delivered prior to the conquest of the northern kingdom.

It has been said that this prophecy must have been delivered at a time of great distress, while the nation was smarting under some signal reverse. It is supposed to indicate that it appeared just after an overwhelming defeat of the forces of the Judean kingdom, and the capture of the city Jerusalem. But this, it is apprehended, will hardly be found to be an accurate statement. It is rather indicated that it was delivered at a time when special and extraordinary effort was being put forth by the Edomites to bring to bear upon the kingdom of Judah a force which would be sufficient utterly to destroy it. It is altogether probable that there were some peculiarities in the circumstances of the kingdom which invited or incited to such an effort, and the knowledge of their endeavor to seize upon this opportunity would have a natural tendency to bring up in review their former actions, especially the course which had been followed in former periods of distress. Old grievances would then reappear, and the bitter feelings of the past would revive with all the potency of new inflictions. Particularly does there seem revived the bitterness arising from the memory of a former humiliation by the invasion of the Jewish territories, the defeat of its armies, and the capture of its capital. (V. 11.) There is no charge that the Edomites were actively engaged in the invasion of its territories, nor yet that they assisted in conquering them. They seem to have in that instance acted the part merely of interested spectators, with all their sympathies on the side of the foes of the Judean kingdom. But when the conquest was completed, they seem to be charged

* Smith's "Biblical Dictionary," Art. *Assyria.*

with having joined in the revelry of the victors, and with cowardly hate, and unmanly cruelty, to have harassed, seized, and surrendered the fugitives.

In the endeavor to fix upon the particular transaction to which reference is here made, it seems hardly possible to refer it to the invasion of Shishak, the Egyptian, (1 Kings xiv, 25,) since the Edomites were then in subjection to the Judean kingdom. Indeed, the incursion of Shishak does not appear to have materially affected the kingdom, otherwise than by the loss of treasure, and perhaps of somewhat of prestige; and down to the time of Jehoram the Edomites remained in subjection to the successors of Solomon. It was during the reign of Jehoram that the Edomites revolted from "under the dominion of Judah, and made themselves a king." (2 Chron. xxi, 8.) During the same reign, but subsequently to this revolt, "the Philistines and the Arabians" of the south "came up into Judah, and brake into it, and carried away all the substance that was found in the king's house;" in other words, defeated his "host" or armies, and spoiled the city Jerusalem. (2 Chron. xxi, 17.) The Edomites were in no condition to do much in the way of military assistance at that time. They had gained their independence so recently as scarcely to have been known in all probability as independent. Yet they were in just such circumstances as would naturally cause them to pursue the line of conduct which is charged upon them. Their long servitude would naturally debase as well as embitter, and the opportunity to harass and exult over the fallen fortunes of their former oppressor could hardly fail to be employed. If any stress may be laid upon the expressions "*strangers*" and "foreigners," as indicating two distinct peoples, then it might be considered as settled that reference is had to this invasion of these two distinct peoples, the Philistines and Arabians, as "strangers" and "foreigners," in contradistinction to the Israelites of the northern kingdom. And these terms expressly preclude our applying it to any invasion in which the kings of Israel were concerned. To throw it later, as late, say, as the invasion by the Philistines in the reigns of Ahaz, besides being incompatible with the suggestion of there being, at the age of the writer, but little known as to the greatness of the Assyrian power, when at the very time Israel was ready to

be subjugated by Tiglath-Pilezer, and Ahaz was himself paying court to him, there seems no good reason for supposing that at that period, when the favor of the Assyrian monarch was assured to Judah, there would be offered any good chance for a successful combination against the Judean kingdom.

If, then, these conclusions are correct, the prophecy must have been written not earlier than B. C. 885 nor later than B. C. 742. It may assist in a nearer definition if we can find a period when the circumstances of Judah seemed especially to invite attack, or when there might appear to be a favorable time to form a combination against her "among the nations."

The brief reigns of Ahaziah, the successor of Jehoram, and of his mother, Athaliah, (B. C. 885–878,) are unmarked by any indications of disturbance by the neighboring nations. And there does not seem any special reason why that period should be chosen for any attack upon it. Its very defection from the religion of Judaism would bring it into greater harmony with "the nations," and thus lessen, humanly speaking, the reasons for such confederation. The reign of Joash, so long as the high-priest, Jehoiada, lived, seems equally free from all foreign interference, and offered no favorable opportunity for a successful invasion. The reign of his successor, Amaziah, was indeed characterized by a war against Edom, in which he was successful, and one against Israel, provoked by himself, in which he was defeated. The prosperous reigns of Uzziah, who led his forces victoriously into the countries of the Philistines and Arabs, and received tribute from the Ammonites, and the reign of Jotham, his son, presented no favorable opportunity or encouragement for any project for the subjugation of the kingdom. The succeeding reign of Ahaz, as we have said, was so closely connected with the Assyrian monarch as to render it even still less likely to meet the requirements of this prophecy. The closing years (B. C. 844–838) of the reign of Joash, however, would seem to present the opportunities for attempting a confederacy for the destruction of the Judean kingdom. Its disorganized state is indicated by the first measures which were taken by his son and successor, Amaziah, who immediately numbered the people, and reorganized its military force. The invasion by the Syrians, the disorders and conspiracies which seemed to have distracted the land, and which finally

terminated the life of Joash, would offer temptations which an active and enterprising enemy would find difficulty in resisting. That some offense had at this time been committed, seems evident from the subsequent actions of Amaziah. For how else can it be accounted for that immediately upon his accession to the throne, and the reorganization of the military, Amaziah should hire auxiliaries from Israel to join him, and straightway march against Edom? What can better account for the severity of the king than the discovery of a treacherous purpose to form a confederacy against it, and the attempt to take advantage of the disturbances of the kingdom to work its utter destruction? If these considerations seem sufficient to fix the date, they would point to the interval B. C. 844 to 838, and with this conclusion we rest the examination as to the chronological data.

In relation to the *person* who wrote the prophecy a few words may be hazarded. The name Obadiah in this form occurs but ten times elsewhere than in this prophecy. In the form עֹבַדְיָהוּ, Obadyahu, it occurs nine times, seven of these times in reference to Ahab's pious "governor" (1 Kings xviii, 3, 4, etc.) Of the entire number who are thus named two only belong to Judah, and one to Benjamin; the remainder, with the exception of three Levites, belong to the tribes of the northern kingdom. But the name does not occur at any time in the historical books so as to allow an identification with this prophet. The balance of probabilities, however, seems favorable to the idea of his having his residence, and having delivered his prophecy, within the territories of the king of Israel. It may now be noted that a prophet is named in the reign of Pekah, (B. C. 741,) as living in Samaria, who must have been held in the highest estimation. His influence was evidently very great, and his name and character widely known. Such, indeed, was the power which he exerted over the minds of the chiefs and people, that he was able, by his counsel and denunciation, to cause the return to Judah of the rich booty and captives taken from the unfortunate Ahaz. The name given in the Hebrew text is עוֹדֵד, (Oded.) In Josephus however, it is given as Obedas, (Ὀβηδας.) This is not the name which is given to the author of this prophecy, but the similarity, and the fact of such a variation as this, may suggest an

inquiry as to whether this might not be the author of this book. There is a difficulty, but not an insuperable one, in the lapse of time from the date of Obadiah's prophecy, herein accepted, and the period of Oded's appearance. It would compel us to put his age (B. C. 741) at not younger than one hundred and twenty years, ten years greater than the venerable age to which Samuel reached, but an age, perhaps, not infrequent in those days of primitive simplicity. An instance in point is that of Jehoiada, high-priest under Joash, who died B. C. 844,* at the age of one hundred and thirty years. If this may be allowed, the reverence for age, characteristic of the period and nation, may account for Oded's (Obadiah's) great influence, and may have had its effect in causing the returning leaders of the victorious Israelites to surrender their trophies. The compassionate spirit, mingling with the most inflexible courage and sternness in denunciation which runs through the brief utterance of Oded, as recorded in 2 Chron. xxviii, 9, may also be found in this prophecy, so that there can hardly be any objection to the suggestion from internal considerations.

The book falls naturally into five parts :—

I. The revelation of Edom's attempt at a confederation of the nations against Judah, (verse 1.)

II. The denunciation of Jehovah's judgments and the reasons for it, (verses 2–11.)

III. The dehortation, (verses 12–16,) containing inseparably,

1. A historic outline of calamities previously suffered by Israel.
2. A prediction of similar but more terrible calamities to fall upon the kingdom of Judah.
3. An implied charge as to the past, and a prediction as to the future of Edom's fiendish cruelty, and exultation over the calamities of Judah.

* The Dictionaries, (Art. Jehoiada,) following what seems to be a misprint in Calmet, all give B. C. 834 as the date of Jehoiada's death. But Joash died B. C. 838, and Zechariah, successor of Jehoiada, was killed B. C. 836. The advanced age of Jehoiada, at the time of his death, renders it probable that Jehoshabeath was his second wife, and that his successor, Zechariah, was his grandson—his father, Barachias, having died during the long incumbency of Jehoiada—thus identifying and justifying our Saviour's expression, "Zacharias, the son of Barachias." (Matt. xxiii, 35.)

4. A dehortation from a continuance in this course as foreseen and predicted, grounded upon, 1.) The approaching judgments upon all the contiguous nations; 2.) The certainty of a terrible retribution upon Edom.

IV. The final victory and deliverance of the house of Jacob, (verses 17–21, a.)

V. The supremacy of Jehovah's kingdom, (verse 21, b.)

THE VISION OF OBADIAH.

1 Thus saith the Lord Jehovah concerning Edom·
(Yea) From Jehovah have we heard the message,
That an embassador had been sent among the nations,
(Crying) "Arise ye, and we also will arise against her in war."

2 Behold, little have I made thee among the nations,
Thou hast (deservedly) been greatly despised!
3 The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee
Dweller in the clefts of the rock,
His lofty habitation!
Saying in his heart
"Who shall cast me down?"

4 Though thou makest high as the eagle,
Even though among the stars thou settest thy nest,
From thence will I bring thee down, is Jehovah's (revealed) word!

5 If thieves come upon thee,—
If robbers by night,—
How art thou destroyed!—
Would they not steal sufficient for them?
If grape-gatherers come upon thee
Would they not leave gleanings?—
6 How are the things of Esau sought out;
His hidden treasures discovered!

7 As far as the border have all the men of thy covenant sent thee;
Have deceived thee,
Shall prevail against thee,
The men of thy peace:
As thy bread shall they place a snare under thee,
—There is none understanding in him.

8 Is not in that day the word of Jehovah,
That "I will destroy the wise from out of Edom,
And understanding from the mount of Esau,
9 And thy heroes shall be dismayed, O Teman?
For each one shall be cut off from the mountain of Esau by slaughter."

10 Because of thy violence toward thy brother Jacob, shame shall cover thee
And thou shalt be cut off forever.

11 In the day of thy standing over against,
In the day of strangers taking captive his host,
So that foreigners entered his gates,
And upon Jerusalem cast the lot,
Thou also wast as one of them.

12 Yet look not thou upon the day of thy brother,
In the day of his strange fate:
And exult not thou over the sons of Judah,
In the day of their destruction;
And enlarge not thy mouth,
In the day of their distress:
13 Enter not thou the gate of my people,
In the day of their misfortunes
And look not thou, even thou! upon his adversity,
In the day of his misfortunes;
And lay not thou hands upon his army,
In the day of his misfortunes;
14 And stand thou not in the forks of the way
To cut off his escape;
And deliver thou not up his survivors,
In the day of (his) distress;
15 For nigh is the day of Jehovah upon all the nations;
As thou hast done, and dost do, it shall be done unto thee,
Thy deed shall return upon thine own head!

16 For as ye have drunken upon my holy mountain,
All the nations shall drink continuously:
They shall swallow greedily,
And shall be as if they had not been!

17 But upon Mount Zion there shall be the escaped;
And it shall be a Holy place;
And the house of Jacob shall enjoy their possessions.
18 And the house of Jacob shall be a fire,
And the house of Joseph shall be a flame,
And the house of Esau shall be for stubble,
And shall kindle among them,
And shall consume them:
And there shall not be a survivor to the house of Esau:
For Jehovah hath spoken!
19 And they of the Negebh shall possess the mountains of Esau,
And they of the Shephelah (shall possess the land) of the Philistines:
(These same) shall possess the fields of Ephraim, and the fields of Samaria:
And Benjamin shall possess Gilead,
20 And the captives of this host of the children of Israel, which the Canaanites
(lead captive unto) Zarephath.
And the captives of Jerusalem which (were led captive) into Sepharad,
Shall possess the cities of the Negebh:

21 And deliverers shall go up into Mount Zion,
To rule over Mount Esau.
And the kingdom shall be unto JEHOVAH!

1. "The vision" (חָזוֹן=*ḥazon*—that which through the revelation of God to him was as if seen by or) "of Obadiah." "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah concerning Edom," (as to what Edom had done, and as to what would result to Edom,) (yea) "from Jehovah have we heard" (a sudden change of construction as to person and number, as frequently among the prophets. (See Nord. Heb. Gr., § 708, 1, a.) It might, perhaps, be treated as a parallelism. More properly and strictly it has its application to the statement immediately following, and indicates that Jehovah has so ordered and overruled, that though attempted to be done covertly it had become matter of common rumor, well known and widely disseminated,) "that an embassador had been sent among the nations." (By whom? As the prophecy and rumor relate to Edom, its doings and their results, it seems most natural to understand the embassy to have been sent out by Edom to the surrounding peoples, who might be supposed to be in sympathy with the hostile spirit of the Edomites, and would, therefore, be glad of an opportunity to destroy the Israelitish nationality.) (Crying) "Arise ye, and we will arise against her in war." (An urgent invitation to a combination of their military power with Edom, to be hurled suddenly and with irresistible force against the common foe. Usually this has been attempted to be interpreted on the hypothesis that JEHOVAH had caused an embassy to be sent to the nations for the purpose of inciting them against Edom. But there seems no authority for this interpretation in the context. It certainly does not appear to be in harmony with the progress of the vision, and no record of any such confederacy against Edom as this would imply is found. But if such a confederacy was God's instrument in humbling Edom, it is difficult to account for the absence of further record of it, while the failure of the attempt by Edom may sufficiently account for no further mention being made of it. Moreover, עָלֶיהָ, "against HER," can hardly be grammatically construed to apply to the masculine noun Edom, since the feminine construction with that noun nowhere else occurs. Throughout this prophecy, when the reference is *indisputably to Edom*, the MASCULINE pronoun is used.

The parallel passage in Jer. xlix, 14 cannot be used as against this, since though עָלֶיהָ might there be referred to the feminine noun, Bozrah, yet it is capable of the interpretation herein given in perfect harmony with its context. In Jeremiah xlix, after the expression in verse 14, "Gather ye together and come against her, and rise up to the battle," there must be supplied from verse 12, "Thou shalt not go unpunished;" the sentiment being, All in vain; this did not answer its intended purpose; thou shalt be desolate and waste; for, lo! I have made thee little, etc. In each case it must be understood that the prophets adduce this overt act of Edom, in endeavoring to form this confederacy against the Judean kingdom or Israel, as the crowning offense, and immediate occasion provocative of this denunciation of God's judgment upon the nation.)

2. "Behold, little have I made thee among the nations; thou hast deservedly been greatly despised!" (This embassy has not succeeded. Jehovah so interposed that Edom has been by its means greatly humiliated. His littleness has been shown up. Deserved contempt has been heaped upon him. Thus God often so overrules that the counsels and purposes of the wicked are turned against themselves.)

3. "The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, dweller in the clefts of the rock, his lofty habitation! saying in his heart, 'Who shall cast me down?'" (Edom felt himself secure in the inaccessible, lofty rocky fastnesses among which he had fixed his capital, Sela or Petra. Such heights abounded in his territories. The remains of his chief city, Petra, even in their ruins, at this day strike the traveler with astonishment and admiration. Granting that its marvelous architectural ornamentation, and the skill displayed in its magnificent buildings or excavations, were the product of a later age, and of their Nebathean successors, it would seem to justify the expectation that from its inaccessible position, its height commanding all the approaches, a people could dwell in security, and laugh at every attempt to dislodge or destroy them. This natural security and advantage only serve, however, to exhibit more clearly the power with which God moves to accomplish his purposes, and to punish and bring down those who dare to set him at defiance. Edom's sin of proud self-security went "before his destruction," his "haughty spirit before" his "fall;"

—led, indeed, into the very course which precipitated his overthrow.)

4. "Though thou makest high as the eagle, even though among the stars thou settest thy nest, from thence will I bring thee down, is Jehovah's (revealed) word." (Above the nest of the eagle, beyond the stars, extends the dominion of Jehovah. Vain are all human expedients for security as against His power: and His sure word in the spirit of prophecy revealed his determination to humble and destroy, to make a marked example along the lines of human history of the proud dwellers in the rocky domains of Edom.)

5. "If thieves come upon thee,—if robbers by night,—How art thou destroyed. Would they not steal sufficient for them? If grape-gatherers come upon thee, would they not leave gleanings?"

6. "How are the things of Esau sought out; his hidden treasures discovered." (Usually men are satisfied with securing what is sufficient for their own wants. Even robbers seldom in that day took more than this. But nothing save the utter destruction of all that Edom possesses will fulfill the purposes of the judgment here denounced. The completeness of the desolation here foreseen by the prophet is indicated by the outburst of horror and amazement in the midst of his description, "How art thou destroyed!" Even grape-gatherers, when their express purpose is to gather in the entire vintage, will leave remnants, gleanings of the crop. But in this desolation, with superhuman persistency and determination, shall the land be overrun, such close scrutiny and inquiry shall be made that nothing shall escape. His hidden treasures shall be sought out, and shall become a prey to the spoilers. As against the *power* of God resistance is vain and human effort useless, so from the eye of Him who judgeth the earth nothing can be hidden, but in his own good time can be uncovered. The lesson is for all ages and people.)

7. "As far as the border have all the men of thy covenant sent thee; have deceived thee, shall prevail against thee, the men of thy peace: as thy bread shall they place a snare under thee." (As far as the border, etc.; that is, in the persons of their embassadors, mentioned verse 1. According to custom, they were escorted with all due (hollow) respect and ceremony to the

borders of their several territories, and while they were put off with fair speeches and expressions which should keep up the appearance of faith and trueness to their former treaty obligations, there was no sincere purpose to enter into an armed confederation, or to make common cause with Edom for the destruction of the Hebrew state. Their specious words and courteous civilities served to deceive the Edomites, and to lull them into the expectation of final success by their help. But Jehovah now declares that these very nations, with whom they have hitherto been on terms of amity and peace, shall turn their forces against them and prevail. The introduction of "thy bread" is perplexing. The LXX omit "bread," and make the sentence to mean "they have set snares under thee." מזור (*mazor*) is rendered very variously. Fuerst renders, "Thy friends put nets under thee, and attention is given to them." Gesenius renders, "treachery, plot, falsehood." Keil, with our English version, makes it "wound," and translates, "They make thy bread a wound under thee." Kleinert renders, "As thy bread they lay for thee a snare." The rendering herein given is somewhat more literal, and makes the translation a future one, thus giving the full force to the tense of the verb, "As thy bread shall they place a snare under thee"—that is, they shall so deceitfully represent their course of treacherous procedure as to make the impression that that course will be the means of support to Edom; really laying snares for him, they shall seem to be doing it for his benefit. Edom, however, has not the discernment to detect the cheat, a foreseen fact which elicits the parenthetic outburst, "There is none understanding in him!" And the reason for this he now proceeds to give. The abrupt change of person may be attributed to the fact that the prophet, in this exclamation, is uttering his own (inspired) sentiment indeed, but not any words of *prophecy* actually directed to be uttered." Or it may, perhaps, be the outburst of amazed contempt.)

8. "Is not in that day" (that is, the day when these false nations shall thus act) "the word of Jehovah, that," (כי="as follows," namely, I will, etc., the כי being equivalent to our quotation marks, indicating that the writer is quoting the exact words of another, in this case, Jehovah,) "I will destroy the

* A somewhat different interpretation is embodied in our concluding remarks to the book.

wise from out of Edom, and understanding from the mount of Esau."

9. "And thy heroes" (hitherto so bold) "shall be dismayed," (shall flee in terror,) "O Teman?" (the southern district of Idumea, (Amos i, 12,) so called from Teman, a son of Eliphaz, and grandson of Esau. (Gen. xxxvi, 11, 15.) The change to the direct address adds intensity and force to the expression. The mention of the extreme southern district may be intended especially to show that the entire extent of the Edomite kingdom was to be thus visited with judgment—the course of destruction being, perhaps, indicated as from extreme north to extreme south.) "For each one shall be cut off," (that is, each "wise one." Perhaps, as is often the case in times of public calamity, the distracted and infuriated people in their misery charge their misfortunes upon their leaders and counselors, and thus rejecting their counsel lead them to death. An Ahithophel may also, foreseeing his doom, anticipate it by suicide. The loss of the nation's trusted counselors may well fill with dismay its heroes. But not only shall the wise be cut off, but this shall be followed by the cutting off of the whole nation, as he now proceeds to predict.)

10. "Because of thy violence toward thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee." (Hostility and envy were characteristic of Esau and the Edomites from the time when the birthright passed over to his twin brother, Jacob. (Gen. xxvii, 41.) Such dispositions were not apparent in Jacob and the Israelites. The wickedness of their characteristics, and of the conduct arising from them, is intensified by the fraternal relationship, and is made conspicuous by the long-continued forbearance of the chosen people. A friendly attitude and brotherly course of conduct was indeed enjoined in Israel's divinely instituted law, and this because of the "brotherhood." (Deut. ii, 4, 5; xxxiii, 7.) A fearful and righteous retribution is predicted) "and thou shalt be cut off forever" (as a nationality distinct from the peoples of the earth, utter destruction, the extermination, indeed, of its entire population) "by slaughter!" (a pregnant expression: cut off because of their violence in the slaughter of their brethren, and themselves being afterward retributively slaughtered by their enemies, thus "as they had done so should it be done to them.")

11. "In the day of thy standing over against," (that is, with

hostile intent, see 2 Sam. xviii, 13,) "in the day of strangers taking captive his host," (by some rendered "*treasure:*" not well, since its connection with the verb, the almost universal rendering of which is "to take captive," determines that this word also must be taken, according to almost invariable usage, to mean "multitudes of human beings" usually "armies:" a meaning further confirmed by the results following this "capture" of the "host" of Jacob, namely,) "that foreigners entered his gates," (that is, in the capture of its defenders, the "host" outside, the city fell into the hands of the foreigners) "and upon Jerusalem cast the lot" (to determine, as was the common custom, the distribution of the spoils. The sin of Edom was in the fact that his sympathies were with the spoilers. He is not charged in this instance with aiding and abetting their spoliations with active military force. The charge is simply) "thou also wast as one of them!" referring, doubtless, to the capture of the city Jerusalem by the Philistines and Hamyritic Arabs. (2 Chron. xxi, 16, 17.)

Such had been Edom's course in the past. The prophet now proceeds with the future. He foresees the calamities which are to come upon Israel, and while he dehorts Edom from pursuing a course similar to the preceding he indicates very clearly that there will be no change, and therefore declares the consequences of his future cruelties. The passage is, therefore, to be considered *historic* with reference to the past, *predictive* as to the events of the future, the fulfillments of the predictions however foreseen, yet contingent upon the refusal to hearken to and obey the dehortation which it contains.

12. "Yet look not thou upon the day of thy brother" (that is, with malicious joy) "in the day of his strange fate; and exult not thou over the sons of Judah in the day of their destruction; and enlarge not thou thy mouth" (that is, vaunt not thyself proudly) "in the day of their distress."

13. "Enter not thou the gate of my people in the day of their misfortunes; and look not thou, even thou," (that is, gloat not upon, even thou. A brother of all men should be the last to gloat over the misfortunes of a brother. The close kindred claims compassion and sympathy. It adds greatly to the criminality and despicableness of him that acts in disregard of the claims of a common humanity,) "upon his

adversity in the day of his misfortunes; and lay not thou hands upon his army in the day of his misfortunes:" (or, as some render it, "seize not thou his treasures"—but this is an unusual sense, and that given is the much more frequent use. The triplicate use of the word "misfortunes" indicates the great extremity of their calamities.)

14. "And stand thou not in the forks of the way" (at the point where the roads come together and, *vice versa*, the way divides) "to cut off his escape; and deliver thou not up his survivors" (that is, any who may have fallen into thy hands either by capture or by taking refuge with thee) "in the day of distress." (Instead of "yet look not thou upon," etc., verse 12 and following, our English version has "but thou shouldst not have looked," etc. But the almost universal judgment of the critics is that the grammatical construction of the Hebrew text is against this. With the literal rendering above given the sense is plain enough. The past is fixed and unchangeable. The possibilities of change belong to the future. With respect to events predicted, there must always be understood certain contingencies and possibilities resulting from the principles which are existent as universally applicable in the Divine government. Thus the destruction of Nineveh was a positive prediction, the fulfillment of which was to occur at a given fixed and determinate time. But the very proclamation of the prediction was intended as an overture on the part of Jehovah to let operate the principle that up to a certain stage of human procedure repentance and reformation on the part of the guilty may be the proper grounds for turning away the punishment denounced against them, and so in the very cry of Jonah, though not, perhaps, always expressed, there was understood this contingency. In like manner, the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Hebrew polity was predicted in the most positive terms; and yet there was always held out to them the promise that this should not occur if a proper repentance and humiliation—a complete turning to God—should take place. Hence to this they were always most earnestly exhorted. It was doubtless very greatly with the design of leaving no means untried to bring about that repentance that the predictions were made, the judgments denounced, and the vail of the future withdrawn, that the results might

be fully understood by them. In the instance before us the prophet foresees the fearful calamities which were to come upon his own people. By the same prophetic foresight he understands that the spirit which actuated Edom in the recent events would, if it remained unchanged, result in the aggravation of the sufferings of Israel. Filled with anguish therefor, he breaks out into these words of earnest deprecating dehortation: "Look not thou," etc., etc. As if he had said, "Do not gloat over the misfortunes of a brother: you need not thus act. Your spirit may be changed. Your attitude toward him and toward Jehovah may, if you will it to be so, be wholly changed. Thus there may be to both an escape from the aggravation of divine wrath and judgment. Yet notwithstanding this possibility and the provision of mercy, the burden of prophecy is, that you will pursue the very course which you are here entreated not to follow." The passage, therefore, is to be looked upon as predictive, as well as deprecatory and dehortative or dissuasive.

15. "For nigh is the day of Jehovah upon all the nations. As thou hast done and dost do" (for this force of kal pret. see Nord. H. G., § 964. 1, a,) "it shall be done unto thee. Thy deed shall return upon thine own head." (Thus the prophet returns to the direct prediction, and denounces fearful retribution for the cruelty to which (vs. 10–12) he had made previous reference, and for the acts of inhumanity which they would afterward perform.)

16. "For as" (this connects with what has been stated in verse 11) "ye have drunken upon my holy mountain" (for a brief period. It can hardly be considered as at all improbable that after the fall of Jerusalem, and during the brief period of its occupancy by the Philistines (strangers) and Arabs (foreigners), a portion of the Edomites may have joined in the festivities of the victors in Jerusalem. "all the nations shall drink" (upon thy mountain) "continually." (All the nations that had joined in the former revelries upon MY mountain shall have similar carousals upon *thy* mountains "continually," that is, as long as the Edomites shall exist. They, therefore, shall be alike guilty. In consequence the day of the Lord shall also come upon them: and as final extermination shall be the lot of Edom, so also shall it be to "the nations." "They shall swallow greedily, and shall

be as (if) they had not been." (They shall pass away. "The place which knew them shall know them no more forever." Job x, 19. It will be noted that the text does not say that the nations should *all* drink upon Zion. The address is to Edom. Yet that is not wholly precluded. But the address is, perhaps, best understood by the antithesis, something being clearly to be supplied to correspond with "my mountain:" that is, as you have had your carousals upon my mountain, they shall have their carousals upon your mountains, the sacred places of Edom; and that, while on the one hand they were the instruments impelled by their own greed and wickedness, but yet in the hands of Jehovah, bringing retribution upon Edom, they in turn should meet with a similar recompense or retribution. Notwithstanding the estrangement of Edom, it was not forgotten that he was of Abrahamic lineage through the son of the promise, and stood, therefore, in a somewhat different relation to Jehovah from that occupied by the other nations, Ishmael, perhaps, being excepted, and so, therefore, his destroyers met with a terrible destruction.)

In strong contrast with this final fate of the then existing nationalities, the prophet now brings out the later triumphs and ultimate deliverance of the chosen people. Zion shall be free. It shall be delivered from all its foes and oppressors. It shall be cleansed from all its filth and pollutions. The house of Israel shall regain its territories. It shall also regain its military power. Meantime "the nations shall have overrun and laid waste Edom until there shall be but little left." Then shall "Jacob" turn his military force against the Edomites, destroying what remained ("stubble") and completing the extinction of its nationality. Then shall this "house of Jacob" (namely, the united remnant of Israel—predominant among whom, and alone recognized, shall be the successors of the Judean kingdom, whose capital city shall be the central point of the consolidated dominion) come into the possession of the entire inheritance of Jacob's descendants, and there shall be but one supreme kingdom acknowledged, the kingdom of *Jehovah*. It may now be observed that the peculiar and somewhat ambiguous expression "house of Jacob," when evidently the predominant idea is that of the Judean kingdom, may be accounted for by the fact, and indeed be indicative of it,

that this prophet was of the northern kingdom, to the inhabitants of whom the final supremacy of the southern kingdom would hardly be agreeable. At a later period the expression was frequently employed by Isaiah to designate the kingdom of Judah.

17. "But upon Mount Zion there shall be the escaped; and it shall be a holy place." (The Israelites shall not wholly perish: a remnant shall escape. It shall occupy Zion purified from its defilements, once more the holy place, the sanctuary of the Most High.) "And the house of Jacob" (may perhaps, as noted above, include the entire remnant of the descendants of Jacob; but the phraseology seems to be used as indirectly and inoffensively indicating the supremacy of the authorities established on Zion. The pre-eminence of these was rightly, indeed, connected with the name of Jacob, as being a necessary ultimate fulfillment of the dying patriarch's prediction as to Judah, that from him the scepter should not depart, and unto his Shiloh should the gatherings of the people be. Moreover, since the defection of the ten tribes Judah had been for the most part the only representative of the true theocratic Israel or chosen people)—"shall enjoy their possessions," (as perhaps never before, the land promised to their fathers.)

18. "And the house of Jacob" (the Judean kingdom) "shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph" (the northern kingdom) "shall be a flame." (Fire may exist without flame, but flame cannot be without fire—the flame inseparably from the fire—the two coalescing and acting together as one—for the one object. These expressions mark the vital consolidated power and active aggressive force of the escaped remnants. In all their history the posterity of Jacob have exhibited a marvelous power of endurance, energy, activity, and force. To exterminate them has been demonstrated utterly impossible, and as the ages pass along they multiply, and accumulate an influence which seems destined to establish them in positions of mastery and control. How different with the Edomites!) "And the house of Esau shall be for stubble," (a few survived the conquest of their country, and the laying waste their cities and territories by "the nations;" but they were utterly prostrate, devoid of spirit, like dry "stubble" left by the reapers in the fields, ready for destruction,) "and shall kindle among them, and shall consume them;" (the fire kindles, Judah scatters it,

forces among them; the flames (Joseph) consume them; the conjoint attacks of Jacob's posterity utterly destroy, either by slaughter or incorporation,) "and there shall not be a survivor [left] to the house of Esau," (to bear the name distinctively or to trace his lineage up to Esau.) "For Jehovah hath spoken!" (Only as yet is it prophecy. But the event is certain as if accomplished fact. The desolate wastes of Idumea and Arabia Petræa at this day attest the prophet's truth, and the inspiration of this word.)

It remains only in the completion of this vision that the prophet describe the reoccupation of their territories and the distribution of their heritage in the theocratic kingdom whose august and supreme chief ruler shall be Jehovah.

19. "And they of the Negebh shall possess the mountains of Esau," (the extreme south,) "and they of the Shephelah (shall possess the land) of the Philistines," (the west to the coast.) "(These same) shall possess the fields of Ephraim and the fields of Samaria," (the central parts of Palestine.) "And Benjamin shall possess Gilead," (the eastern part.) "The Negebh" seems here to be the name of a district of country south of the mountains of Judah. "On the north it was bounded by the Shephelah and the mountains of Judah. A line drawn from Wady Sheriah, eastward to Khuweilifeh, and then to Maon, and from thence south-east to the extremity of the Dead Sea, would mark its northern border. On the east it bordered on the Arabah as far south as the parallel of Kedesh. Its southern border did not reach either to the peninsula of Sinai, or to Egypt."—KITTO, *Cyclop.* The inhabitants of the Negebh were in vision, therefore, seen migrating in force, and taking possession of the mountains of Esau, which lay south and east of the Negebh. "The Shephelah was the native name of the tract of country lying between the highlands of Judea and the Mediterranean Sea to the south of Sharon."—KITTO, *Cyclop.* This word, usually translated in our English version "vale," "valley," "plain," "low country," etc., was not, however, restricted to this meaning, but was so applied as to include the hills inclosing the plains, as in this instance: the inhabitants of the country west should spread themselves over and master the country of the Philistines to the coast of the Mediterranean, and then north-westwardly and north-east-

"compassed him in," in other words, had surrounded him, and that during the night Jehoram, by an unexpected attack, broke through the Edomite forces and escaped, but not without suffering; in the fight, however, inflicting upon his foes much damage and loss, especially and wisely disabling their chariots, and thus perhaps rendering pursuit less possible and less disastrous. What people "fled to their tents" is not clearly discernible; but the most probable meaning is that the Israelites made good their escape to their previous encampment, so that but few, if any, captives could be taken. It may be possible, but is nowhere so stated or charged, that Edom was concerned in the raid made in connection with the Philistines and is included under the general name of "the Arabians," which were near the Ethiopians, (Cushites,) at which time captives and spoil were taken from Jerusalem, even the king's children being slain by them. At a later period during the reign of Ahaz, and possibly contemporaneously with the closing years of this prophet, the Edomites engaged in a successful foray into the Judean territory. (2 Kings xvi, 7; 2 Chron. xxviii, 16.) From the passage in Kings it seems clear that about this time the kings of Syria, Israel, and Edom were confederates, and as a result of the war put Edom or Syria into permanent possession of Elath. (Edom, if the LXX read correctly their copy, but Syria if a ד has not erroneously been written for ר, a difference the same as in Deuel for Reuel.) But the earlier date of this prophecy precludes any connection with these later events, and the better way seems to require its reference to the Arabs as having taken the captives) "which were led captive unto Sepharad." (The verb "led captive" is suggested to complete the sentence, from the noun "captives." But where is Sepharad? As the other places named are found in the regions contiguous to the kingdom of Judah, it would seem that Sepharad ought similarly to be found. And as the corresponding name in the parallelism is found among the Philistines in the extreme north, this may reasonably be sought in the extreme south among their allies, the Arabs, who had succeeded in securing the captives. May not, after all, this be the same as Sephar or Dhafarzeyd, (Zafari,) and be found in the remote district of Arabia near the Red Sea? For this name the Septuagint reads "Ephrata," which various reading is only

wardly to take possession of the allotment of Ephraim, "the fields of Samaria," the territories of the rulers of Samaria, which were probably since Jehu's time confined to the western side of Jordan. (2 Kings x, 32, 33.) Thus the inhabitants of the Shephelah, or western outskirts of Judah, were to possess the western and central parts of Palestine. *Gilead* lay beyond or east of Jordan; it was the allotment of Gad, and at its south-western extremity lay along the eastern bank of Jordan, partly opposite to Benjamin. Crossing over the Jordan, the Benjamites, the weaker members of the Judean kingdom, were to possess themselves of the formerly trans-Jordanic Israelitish territory.

It will have been observed that all these migrations have their starting point from within the limits of the Judean kingdom, and result in bringing the western, the central, and the eastern parts of what had been the kingdom of Israel, and the southern kingdom of Edom under the authority of the Davidic succession. By these migrations, moreover, the Shephelah and the Negebh were at least partially drained of their inhabitants, and thus made room for another people.

20. "And the captives of this host of the children of Israel." (what "host?" For answer, we can only with propriety refer to the captives) "which the Canaanites" (or Philistines in conjunction with "the Arabians, that were near unto Ethiopia." 2 Chron. xxi, 16) "led captive" (during the reign of Jehoram. These Philistines are denominated "Canaanites," from the general or common name of the country, of whose inhabitants they formed an important part. So the "host," or army, is said to be "of the children of Israel," although more strictly of the Judean kingdom, just as Jehoshaphat and Ahaz are called "kings of Israel" (2 Chron. xxi, 2; xxviii, 19) while strictly only "kings of Judah." The definite article (הַ—) points directly to *the* "host" named in vs. 11, 13. These were led, some of them perhaps,) "unto Zarephath," (the supposed ancient name of the modern town of Sarafend, near Zidon) "And the captives of Jerusalem" (could hardly be those taken by the Edomites in their revolt from Jehoram, who endeavored without success, to reconquer them. The narrative of this attempt, and of the consequent battle at Zair, is in both the records (2 Kings viii, 20, etc.; and 2 Chron. xxi, 8, etc.) somewhat ambiguous; but it would seem that the Edomites had

valuable as suggesting that the situation of the place w... southward and in a fruitful land. (Arabia Felix?) Othe... (Chaldaic and Syriac) suppose Spain to be intended. Jerom... gives as the Jewish rendering "Bosphorus"—which of the tw... of that name he does not indicate. De Sacy suggests "Sardis." Others, "Sparta." A late theory supposes it to be found amo... the names between Cappadocia and Ionia, in the cuneiform inscriptions written Ç'parda. But no one has been able clearly to substantiate any of these places as the Sepharad of the tex... and it is, therefore, after all the researches of commentators and biblicists, an undiscovered place. The suggestion herein give... seems most probable and harmonious with the historic frag... ments given us in Kings and Chronicles. Returning from th... place of their captivity, wheresoever that may have been, they... in connection with those returning from Zarephath,) "shall possess the cities of the Negebh," (the cities of the most south... ern territories of Judah and Simeon, and the region lying contiguous thereto; the region, indeed, from whence they had been taken, and which had been depopulated in measure by the migrations noted in verse 19. Thus the previous lack shall be supplied, and prosperity again be given to the country. "And deliverers" (that is, after this the heroes whose wisdo... and valor had brought deliverance) "shall go up into Mount Zion" (to restore again to its former seat and sovereignty the kingdom that it may rule over its rightful territory, and al... having conquered) "to rule over the mount of Esau," (exer... cising dominion, and executing justice and judgment accordi... to the law of Zion, over the formerly antagonistic possessio... of the Edomites. But this only subordinately.) "And the kingdom" (the real power and ruling authority by origin... and indefeasible jurisdiction) "shall be to Jehovah!" to whom, as supreme over all, his august majesty duly and rev... ently recognized and obeyed, there shall be indeed ascribed a... might, sovereignty, and dominion for evermore! "Beautif... upon the mountains are the feet of him . . . that saith unt... Zion, THY GOD REIGNETH."

A general view of this prophecy and of its fulfillment may now be presented. It will be remembered that the hostility of Edom was chiefly directed against the Judean kingdom. There was, of course, originally, enmity toward the entire posterity of

Jacob. But after the defection of the Ten Tribes, various circumstances tended to modify this feeling; to weaken it toward the northern, and to intensify it toward the southern kingdom. Thus the tendency of Jeroboam and his successors to adopt the religion of the surrounding nations made them less distasteful to "the nations," as is evinced by their more frequently being found in alliance with them. The perpetual rivalry and antagonisms of the two kingdoms also diminished the likelihood that either would be able for any considerable period to do more than maintain jurisdiction over their own domain, if indeed they could do that. The Judean kingdom was moreover to the Edomites much the more dangerous, as being an adjoining territory. It had already held them in humiliating dependency, and had in more than one instance during their partial independence asserted claims to portions of country which were held by Edom. There were therefore continual fears and jealousies arising; and while the old feeling was so far modified toward the separated ten tribes as to make an alliance with them desirable, the intensity of their hostility toward Judah, added to fear and jealousy, made it a matter of the utmost importance that such an alliance should be turned to the destruction of this, their nearest, most dangerous, and enterprising rival. It will be seen, therefore, that the prophet brings out, as most distasteful to Edom, and the very opposite of its wishes and purposes, the fact that the final issue of all their conflicts will be the complete supremacy of Judah over not only Edom, but also Israel, in such sense as that Israel shall be absorbed by Judah, lose its separate existence, and be used to bring into subjection even Edom itself.

We have already seen that there is good ground for the statement that Edom had endeavored to form a strong combination of the nations against the kingdom of Judah, and that such effort had not so succeeded as to give to Edom any permanent advantage. In one instance only do they appear to have been the gainers by an alliance if the emended reading is correct, namely, when united with Syria and Israel. In that case, if Edom be the true reading, they were allowed to retain permanent possession of Elath on the Red Sea. From the evident persistent determination of the Edomites to accomplish the destruction of the kingdom of Judah, there is not the least im-

probability in the assertion made, verse 12, of a vigorous effort at a particular time to unite all the other nations with themselves. The failure of the effort, under Jehovah, may, on the human side, be accounted for from its being apparent to the other nations that a restless and unprincipled neighbor, like Edom, was, to them, more dangerous than the kingdom of Judah could be; and that their true policy was that this kingdom should remain as a counterpoise to the Edomites. Moreover, the period was one of great unrest and anxious foreboding, arising out of the ambition of Egypt on the one hand, and the growing and menacing power of the Assyrians and Chaldeans on the other. The time was not a propitious one in which to expend resources in the interest of one ambitious or resentful petty nation, which might be needed in making common cause against a more powerful and dangerous enemy. Yet it was by no means politic to offend a nation situated as Edom was, and therefore the temporizing policy indicated in verse 7 is just what might be expected.

That there were jealousies and dissensions also among the nations surrounding Judea, so that no one of them fully trusted any other, seems clearly indicated in the slaughter of the Edomites by the Moabites and Ammonites while apparently in full accord with each other, and leagued together for the destruction of Jehoshaphat. It needed but the misunderstanding and confusion consequent upon the "ambushment" which Jehovah set, to excite into activity their latent suspicion of each other, and to so inflame them as to cause them to slaughter each other. (2 Chron. xx, 23.) (See also 2 Kings iii, 26, where Edom is opposed to Moab in perhaps unwilling co-operation with Judah. The Moabites seem to be especially enraged against the Edomites.) All these circumstances seem to point to the fact that duplicity must have characterized to a great extent the dealings of these nations one with the other. (Verse 7.) The historic statements in verses 10 and 11 need no further notice. The duplex historical references in verses 12–14, the one to the events described in verses 10 and 11 as the type, and the other to the antetypical events yet future, and now predicted in the successive destructions of Jerusalem—chiefly in that by the Chaldeans—are justified by the well-known facts of the history of that destruction found in Josephus and in holy writ. For the

predictions found in verses 19 and 20 the historic fulfillments are difficult to identify. The fulfillments may have occurred in the then near future, in the movements which took place prior to the destruction of Jerusalem; "the nations" having enough to do in watching the menacing forces of the great empires, without retaining an element so dangerous, and, in the times of invasion, so difficult to manage, as a hostile people in unwilling captivity in their midst; and so there is nothing at all against probability in the fulfillment of this prediction, that the captives taken in that generation, should, even within a period not distant, return again and spread themselves over the depopulated territories of Israel, their former homes in Judea and the trans-Jordanic provinces. To such returns there seem to be references in the words of Nehemiah x, 26–28. If Sepharad be taken as in Southern Arabia, it can hardly be thought improbable that the captives there should take advantage of the invasion of the Nabatheans, (see note below,) with whom they may have become somewhat identified, and returning, enter and possess the cities of the Negebh at a period earlier than the second captivity.

That the Edomites continued their hostile and cruel course throughout their subsequent history is fully established by the references to them in the Psalms and the later prophetical writings. They manifested a wild, exultant joy as the Chaldeans swept over the country and razed to its very foundations the Jewish capital. The deportation of the inhabitants left room for a new population, and the Edomites availed themselves gladly of the opening thus made to spread themselves westward and northward, until they had put themselves in possession of Southern Judea.* In the after-ages, by the opening of new routes for commerce and the conquest of the country by the

* This migration, however, may have been the result of a necessity growing out of the invasion of the Edomite country by their former friends and allies, the Nabatheans, who at some time drove them out of "Mount Esau," and established a powerful and enterprising kingdom, having Petra for its capital. Thus, it was taken from Edom the highway for the rich traffic between Arabia and Egypt, for the use of which its kings had perhaps been accustomed to exact a heavy tribute, and thus made it a great source of wealth—"its bread." This may suggest a possible different interpretation to verse 7. For, applying it to these Arabs, thus "prevailed against them" most emphatically "the men of their peace"—the men then at peace with them. Thus, too, this highway, yielding a rich revenue—"its bread"—was doubtless a chief object of desire on the part of

Romans, the commercial enterprise and wealth of the inhabitants of the Edomite territories began to decline, and the final blow to their power was given by the fierce followers of Mohammed, who overran the country, ruined their cities, laid waste their lands, and so effected that the country became a desolation, and its inhabitants fell back into a barbaric nomad state. Verse 6.

Meantime the total destruction of the Edomites as a nation was accomplished. After suffering several disastrous defeats by John Hyrcanus, they were finally subdued by him B. C. 129, were compelled to submit to circumcision and the Mosaic ritual, and the last of them were subjugated by Alexander Jannæus. Simon the Gerasene devastated their land in a fearful manner, and the Edomites in Jerusalem were destroyed by the Romans. The few who yet remained were lost among the Arabs, so that the Edomitish people were "cut off forever," (verse 10,) and their very name disappeared from the earth. (See Keil on Obadiah.) The chief instruments in their final destruction were the Maccabean "deliverers," (verses 18–21,) who had established themselves upon "Mount Zion" and re-established the Judean kingdom, ruling as well the mountains of Esau as the original territorial allotments of the descendants of Jacob. This kingdom did not pass away until the "kingdom of God" was announced and began the manifestations of its might in the person of "the Deliverer," the Saviour, Jesus Christ, and demonstrably the sole "kingdom was to Jehovah."

Running through this entire prophecy is the one fact, predicted for all times, and to be the constant paradox of history, "that the children of Jacob shall not be utterly consumed, that a remnant should escape the calamities and overwhelming misfortunes which shall come upon their country." In the fulfillment of this prediction, a fulfillment perpetually before the eyes of all nations, there is the continual evidence of the great truth that all real power is in and from Jehovah, and that the kingdom is to him, and shall ultimately by all be ascribed to him, a truth which the followers of Jesus Messiah as heart-

the invaders, and they who paid the tribute may very properly be called "men of" Edom's "bread." The familiarity with the country gained by their commercial expeditions enabled them to "set a snare under Edom"—to lay and execute their treacherous designs in the most effectual way for the seizure of the country.

accept and as devoutly cherish as do the escaped remnant who yet await the coming of their Messiah Prince. "Majestic, comprehensive simplicity of prophecy! All time and eternity, the struggle of time and the rest of eternity, are summed up in these words, 'the kingdom shall be to Jehovah.' Zion and Edom retire from sight; both are comprehended in that one kingdom, and God *is all in all.* The strife is ended; not that ancient strife only between the evil and the good, the oppressor and the oppressed, the subduer and the subdued; but the whole strife and disobedience of the creature toward the Creator, man against his God. Blessed, peaceful kingdom! Even here in this valley of tears and of strife, where God rules the soul, freeing it from the tyranny of the world and Satan, and its own passions, inspiring it to know Himself, the Highest Truth, and to love Him who is Love, and to adore Him who is Infinite Majesty."—*Pusey.*

Basing his denunciations upon an event in the history of his people prior to the events which are fundamentally connected with the utterances of the other prophets of this section, and keeping in view throughout the real perpetuity of the chosen people and their continued national existence until *their* kingdom should be merged in the kingdom which would be professedly and pre-eminently the kingdom of Jehovah, and so recognized in its entire history, this prophet rightfully claims a place among the first in order; and as the seed of future prophetic utterances, a prime importance and attention which has not hitherto been accorded him. May the lessons of fraternal affection and the duties which grow out of it—the instructive but terrible example of destructive judgment for the violation of the obligation of brotherhood among nations—the exhibition of the tender care of Jehovah for his people even when erring, and the abundant manifestations of favor upon their return, not be lost upon reader or writer hereof; but may the blessedness of Jehovah's rule be matter of personal experience, as under his established and recognized kingdom we live, awaiting the hour when, indeed, the judgments upon the descendants of his ancient people shall be overpast, and upon Mount Zion the throne of Messiah the Saviour shall be established, never again to be displaced!

Art. II.—AN EXTRAORDINARY CHARACTER.

Mary Somerville's name is familiar throughout the civilized world, and her remarkable life of scientific study and success has often been sketched as a demonstration of woman's capacity for the highest intellectual pursuits; but its significance can hardly be exhausted, and it can well bear repeated study as a phenomenon in the history of her sex.

The present century has made a new era in the intellectual life of woman. She has not failed in other periods to give proof of literary capacity, but the instances have, before the present age, been only occasional, and have, therefore, appeared to be exceptional. In our day women fairly throng the field of the lighter kinds of literary labor. In poetry and fiction their success is no longer disputable. In biography and history, also, they have been taking rank by the side of man. Occasional examples, like that of Mary Somerville, show that they may aspire to the highest attainments of the male intellect, to the loftiest regions of abstract science.

In several respects Mary Somerville's success should be an example, a provocation, to the intellectual ambition of her sex: for it is not attributable to extraordinary advantages, or even exceptional circumstances. Intellectually *she made herself*, by means which are within the reach of most women of the "middle class;" for, though of "gentle blood," practically she pertained to that class throughout her life.

She was born in Jedburgh, Scotland, December 26, 1780. Her father was a naval captain, and therefore absent from home most of his time. The family lived on a bare competence at Burnt Island, a small seaport town on the coast of Fife, immediately opposite to Edinburgh. Her mother had no special qualifications for the training of such an intellect as her child subsequently revealed. "My mother," she says, "taught me to read the Bible and to say my prayers, otherwise she allowed me to grow up a wild creature." When between eight and nine years old she knew not how to write, and "read very badly." She had amused herself somewhat with the "Arabian Nights," "Robinson Crusoe," and the "Pilgrim's Progress." Her father, returning from sea, and mortified at

her little progress during his absence, put her to advanced reading, but with slight advantage. If she was not really afflicted with mental stupidity at this period of her life, she certainly showed no kind of mental precocity. The compulsory reading of a daily paper of the "Spectator" was such a task "that," she writes in her old age, "I have never since opened the book. 'Hume's History of England' was also a real penance to me. My father, at last, said to my mother, 'This kind of life will never do. Mary must at least know how to write and keep accounts.'" So at ten years of age she was sent to a boarding school, where it is a wonder that the small amount of intellect she seemed to have was not entirely stultified by the absurd discipline to which she was subjected. "The chief thing I had to do," she says, "was to learn by heart a page of Johnson's 'Dictionary,' not only to spell the words, give their parts of speech and meaning, but, as an exercise of memory, to remember their order of succession." On her return home, after a year of such training, she was reproached with having "cost so much money in vain." "My mother said she would have been contented if I had only learned to write well and keep accounts, which were all a woman was expected to know. I was like a wild animal escaped out of a cage." She complains of even an uncommonly defective memory: "I could remember neither names nor dates." Before she began to read algebra she had to restudy arithmetic, having forgotten much of it. "I never was expert at addition," she says, "for in summing up a long column of pounds, shillings, and pence in the family account-book, it seldom came out twice in the same way." In her later studies she, of course, used logarithms for the higher branches of science. Here was certainly no portentous sign of genius, nothing like that precocity which is usually supposed to presage a great intellectual career. An intellectual prodigy as a woman, she was apparently beneath mediocrity as a child. The fact affords a lesson which may well be remembered by parents who grieve over the supposed inferiority of their children.

It is a curious question, to say the least of it, how such a mind came at last to be awakened to higher aspirations and endeavors. It was not by parental remonstrances or compul-

sory studies, nor by any spasmodic impulse from within or from without. It was entirely by a slow and spontaneous process. After her return from school she says, "My time at Burnt Island was heavy on my hands. I did not know what to do with myself." She spent hours on the sea-shore collecting shells—the beginning of her knowledge of natural history. Her sea-faring father had a passion for flowers, and brought home bulbs and seeds from other parts of the world. She soon shared his taste, and turned the garden of her home into a studio—the beginning of her knowledge of Botany, afterward appreciated and directed by Candolle and similar *savants*. She found a copy of Shakspeare, and the great master inspired her with a love of higher and more varied reading than she had hitherto cared for. There were two small globes in the house; they excited her curiosity, and she learned their use from the village school-master, an evening guest in the family. They were the beginning of the sublime studies which culminated in her immortal works, "The Mechanism of the Heavens," and the "Physical Geography." "My bedroom," she says, "had a window to the south, and a small closet near had one to the north. At these I spent many hours, studying the stars by the aid of the celestial globe." There was a piano in the house. She entertained herself with it until music became a passion with her, and, notwithstanding her poor memory, she could at last "play long pieces without the book." Nasmyth, the artist, opened a school at Edinburgh for ladies; she attended it, hardly as a student, more as a looker on or an amateur, but in time became an accomplished painter. She casually overheard Nasmyth say to a group of ladies, "You should study Euclid's Elements of Geometry, the foundation not only of perspective, but of astronomy and all mechanical science." Her curiosity was aroused by the prospect of such a range of inquiry, and she became the only woman in the world, said La Place, who understood his "Méchanique Céleste."

Thus gradually opened before her the splendid intellectual career in which at last she stood foremost of all the women of her age in scientific fame, the highest example, perhaps—certainly the highest recorded example—of feminine scholarship in the history of the world. But, we repeat, it was without the encouragements or aids which usually prompt youthful

genius; it was in spite of severe discouragements. But her love of knowledge soon became an irrepressible passion. "I had," she writes, "to take part in the household affairs, and to make and mend my own clothes. I rose early, played on the piano, and painted, during the time I could spare in the daylight hours; but I sat up very late reading "Euclid." The servants, however, told my mother, "It is no wonder the stock of candles is soon exhausted, for Miss Mary sits up reading to a very late hour," whereupon an order was given to take away my candle as soon as I was in bed. I had, however, already gone through the first six books of "Euclid," and now I was thrown on my memory, which I exercised by beginning with the first book, and demonstrating in my mind a certain number of problems every night, till I could nearly go through the whole. My father came home for a short time, and, somehow or other, finding out what I was about, said to my mother, "Reg, we must put a stop to this, or we shall have Mary in a straight-jacket some of these days. There was X., who went raving mad about the longitude."

There was genuine heroism in these intellectual struggles of a young girl without sympathy, and without the ordinary facilities of study; and there is a touching pathos in her allusion to her surrounding disadvantages. She was trying, half-bewildered, to make out some consistent astronomical theory from Robinson's "Navigation"—her first book of the kind, casually picked up in her home. "As I persevered," she says, "in studying the book for a time, I certainly got a dim view of several subjects which were useful to me afterward. Unfortunately not one of our acquaintances or relations knew anything of science or natural history, nor, had they done so, should I have had courage to ask any of them a question, for I should have been laughed at. I was often very sad and forlorn, not a hand held out to help me." There was, nevertheless, an unseen, divine hand held out to her, as to all who thus struggle upward, and it lifted her at last not only to, but above, the stars to which her faltering studies aspired.

In the circle of her kindred she found but one generous mind which could sympathize with her. "I spent," she says, "four or five hours daily at the piano; and, for the sake of having something to do, I taught myself Latin enough, from

such books as we had, to read Cesar's Commentaries. I went that summer on a visit to my aunt at Jedburgh, and, for the first time in my life, I met in my uncle, Dr. Somerville, with a friend who approved of my taste for knowledge. During long walks with him in the early mornings he was so kind that I had the courage to tell him I had been trying to learn Latin, but feared it was in vain; for my brother and other boys, superior to me in talent, and with every assistance, spent years in learning it. He assured me, on the contrary, that in ancient times many women—some of them of the highest rank in England—had been very elegant scholars, and that he would read Virgil with me if I would come to his study for an hour or two every morning before breakfast, which I gladly did. I never was happier in my life than during the months I spent at Jedburgh."

She was beautiful in person as well as in mind; "extremely pretty" in her young womanhood, with "a delicate beauty both of face and figure," and was called the "Rose of Jedburgh." She was, therefore, not without early suitors, and in 1804 was married to her cousin, Samuel Greig. They resided for some years in London, but she had few opportunities to avail herself of its advantages for her favorite studies. Her life was still a quiet, patient "struggle for knowledge under difficulties." She says, "I was alone the whole of the day, so I continued my mathematical and other pursuits, but under great disadvantages; for although my husband did not prevent me from studying, I met with no sympathy whatever from him, as he had a very low opinion of the capacity of my sex, and had neither knowledge of nor interest in science of any kind. I took lessons in French, and learned to speak it so as be be understood."

After three years of married life she returned, a widow with two children, to her parental home at Burnt Island, where she resumed her studies with more diligence than ever. Professor Wallace, of Edinburgh University, made her out a catalogue of books in the highest branches of Mathematics. The list was formidable, but she procured them and "mastered" them. They consisted of Francœur's "Pure Mathematics," and his "Elements of Mechanics;" La Croix's "Algebra," and his large work on the "Differential and Integral Calcu-

ia," together with his treatise on "Finite Differences and Series;" Biot's "Analytical Geometry and Astronomy;" Poisson's "Treatise on Mechanics;" La Grange's "Theory of Analytical Functions;" Euler's "Algebra," and his "Isoperimetrical Problems" (in Latin;) Clairault's "Figure of the Earth;" Monge's "Application of Analysis to Geometry;" Callet's "Logarithms;" La Place's "Mécanique Céleste," and his "Analytical Theory of Probabilities." To how many women in the United States could such a list of books be offered without being considered a practical joke, or rather an ironical mockery of the conventional estimate of the capacity of the sex for high education? Could not the number be counted on one's fingers? Are there ten in all the new world? Are there fifty in all the world? Yet it was to the mother of a family, educating herself at home, that Wallace prescribed this course of study! "I was," she says, "thirty-three years of age when I bought this excellent little library. I could hardly believe that I possessed such a treasure when I looked back on the day that I first saw the mysterious word, Algebra, and the long course of years in which I had persevered almost without hope. It taught me never to despair. I had now the means, and pursued my studies with increased assiduity; concealment was no longer possible, nor was it attempted. I was considered eccentric and foolish, and my conduct was highly disapproved of by many, especially by some members of my family. As I was quite independent, I did not care for their criticism."

Her second marriage with her cousin, Dr. William Somerville, in 1812, opened a new life before her. He was a man of considerable learning, but gratefully recognized the superiority of his wife. Their domestic life, though attended by the usual household trials, and at one time by an entire loss of fortune through the treachery of a trusted friend, was a scene of closest mutual sympathy, of joint culture, and the purest happiness. One of their daughters says:—

Nothing can be more erroneous than the statement, repeated in several obituary notices of my mother, that Mr. Greig (her first husband) aided her in her mathematical and other pursuits. Nearly the contrary was the case. Mr. Greig took no interest in science or literature, and possessed in full the prejudice against

learned women which was common at that time. Only on her marriage with my father, my mother at last met with one who entirely sympathized with her, and warmly entered into all her ideas, encouraging her zeal for study to the utmost, and affording her every facility for it in his power. His love and admiration for her were unbounded; he frankly and willingly acknowledged her superiority to himself, and many of our friends can bear witness to the honest pride and gratification which he always testified in the fame and honors she attained.

Two facts are, then, apparent thus far in the intellectual history of this remarkable woman: first, that she had no precocious capacity for the success which distinguished her career; secondly, that she had not even the ordinary facilities and encouragements of such a career—that, down to the time of her second marriage, she prosecuted her studies in the usual domestic circumstances of her sex. Hers was, in fine, a rare, a splendid example of *self-education* in ordinary life—education up to the loftiest, most erudite, and most difficult attainments of science, without a school, without teachers, without one special domestic advantage for study. We know not where to find an equal example in all literary history. This quiet, yet sublime, walk of a modest, and even timid, woman (for such she was) in the common path of the commonplace duties of domestic life, and yet in the grandest career of knowledge, compassing the earth and scaling the heavens, is a marvel of the intellectual world—a demonstration of the spiritual greatness and immortal destination of the human soul.

A third fact is worthy of being emphasized, though it has been already pretty fully indicated, namely, that there was no scientific "hobbyism" in her pursuit of knowledge, no mere indulgence of a special intellectual proclivity, or display of a special mental capacity; but she aimed at complete self-culture and universal knowledge. Her collection of shells and minerals in childhood was the nucleus of a cabinet of conchology and mineralogy which became one of the principal articles of her domestic furniture in maturer life; and while the mathematics, the abstract sciences, were the chief field of her fame, she was a technical and an accomplished naturalist. It may well be doubted whether any woman of her age excelled her in this department alone. She was a thorough botanist. Geology

came up as a science in her day; she began with it nearly at the beginning, kept pace with it down to her ninety-second year, and was one of the first sufferers of public obloquy for its new, misunderstood theory of creation. She was denounced, by name, from the pulpit of York Cathedral for opinions which are now accepted by all authoritative biblical critics. She not only "read up," but studied through the whole varied course of the physical and experimental sciences, down to the most minute and obscure subjects of molecular and microscopic inquiry. Faraday delighted to converse and correspond with her as an appreciative authority in his most recondite researches. La Place was proud to correspond with her as one of the very few minds, in all the intellectual world, who could even understand his treatise on the Celestial Mechanism; and her reproduction and simplification of that matchless work, in her "Mechanism of the Heavens," was itself, it is said, above the intellectual reach of all France, except a few (Poisson said twenty) mathematical scholars. Sir John Herschell read it with "the highest admiration." "What a pity," he exclaimed, "that La Place did not live to see this illustration of his great work!" Whewell, on receiving it, said: "When Mrs. Somerville shows herself in the field which we mathematicians have been laboring in all our lives, and puts us to shame, she ought not to be surprised if we move off to other grounds." Biot was appointed by the *Academie des Sciences*, of Paris, to draw up for it a report on the work. He pronounced it "an astonishing treatise;" and La Croix, Legendre, and the rest of the Parisian mathematicians, shared his "vivid and profound admiration." She was forthwith elected a member of most of the learned societies of Europe; and the Royal Society of London ordered her bust, from Chantrey, to be placed in their great hall. True to her womanhood, her chief joy, amid this universal outburst of applause, in which her kindred, who had hitherto ridiculed her, now enthusiastically joined, was in "the warmth with which Somerville," her husband, entered into her success. "It deeply affected me," she writes, "for not one in ten thousand would have rejoiced at it as he did."

Her "Physical Geography" displayed still more the diversity of her learning. Humboldt read it twice with delight. "It has charmed and instructed me," he wrote. "It showed that,

to the great superiority" of its author "in the high region of mathematical analysis," she joined "variety of knowledge in all departments of physics and natural history." Her "Mechanism of the Heavens," and her "Connection of the Physical Sciences," were objects of Humboldt's "constant admiration." "I know," he said, "in no language a work on Physical Geography" that can be compared with hers. The author of "Cosmos" ought, more than any one else, to hail the "Physical Geography" of Mary Somerville. He expressed surprise at the correctness of her views of the "Geography of Plants and Animals." She "dominates in these regions, as in astronomy, meteorology, and magnetism."

This versatility of her knowledge, combined as it was with depth and accuracy, is among the wonders of her intellectual character. Her daughter says that—

> Although her favorite pursuit, and the one for which she had decidedly most aptitude, was mathematics, yet there were few subjects in which she did not take interest, whether in science or literature, philosophy or politics. She was passionately fond of poetry, her especial favorites being Shakspeare and Dante; and also the great Greek dramatists, whose tragedies she read fluently in the original, being a good classical scholar. She was very fond of music, and devoted much time to it in her youth; and she painted from nature with considerable taste. The latter was, perhaps, the recreation in which she most delighted, from the opportunity it afforded her of contemplating the wonderful beauty of the world, which was a never-failing source of intense enjoyment to her, whether she watched the changing effects of light and shade on her favorite Roman Campagna, or gazed enchanted on the gorgeous sunsets of the Bay of Naples, as she witnessed them from her much-loved Sorrento, where she passed the last summers of her life. All things fair were a joy to her. The flowers we brought her from our rambles, the sea-weeds, the wild birds she saw, all interested and pleased her. Every thing in nature spoke to her of that great God who created all things, the grand and sublimely beautiful, as well as the exquisite loveliness of minute objects. Above all, in the laws which science unvails step by step, she found ever renewed motives for the love and adoration of their Author and sustainer. This fervor of religious feeling accompanied her through life, and very early she shook off all that was dark and narrow in the creed of her first instructors for a purer and a happier faith.

A fourth fact, and one to be especially noted, is, that this high intellectual culture and labor (never, perhaps, equaled

among women) in no wise interfered with her domestic life, or her duties as woman, wife, and mother. She had the good sense to guard her life not only against any perversion, but against any misconstruction in this respect. She affected no eccentricities, claimed no exemptions on the score of her intellectual supremacy, but was of the simplest, purest, finest womanly nature. She brought up a considerable family, and her children blessed her memory. Says one of them:—

> It would be almost incredible how much my mother contrived to do in the course of the day. When my sister and I were small children, although busily engaged in writing for the press, she used to teach us for three hours every morning, besides managing her house carefully, reading the newspapers, (for she always was a keen and, I must add, a liberal politician,) and the most important new books on all subjects, grave and gay. In addition to all this, she freely visited and received her friends. She was, indeed, very fond of society, and did not look for transcendent talent in those with whom she associated, although no one appreciated it more when she found it. Gay and cheerful company was a pleasant relaxation after a hard day's work. My mother never introduced scientific or learned subjects into general conversation. When they were brought forward by others she talked simply and naturally about them, without the slightest pretension to superior knowledge. Finally, to complete the list of her accomplishments, I must add that she was a remarkably neat and skillful needlewoman. We still possess some elaborate specimens of her embroidery and lace work.

This symmetrical and truly beautiful life was not without the usual tests of suffering. She buried children and her two husbands, and at last survived nearly all her early friends. After losing her fortune she was dependent upon a Government pension, first of one thousand, later of fifteen hundred dollars a year, and, for economy, lived many years in Italy. But her intellectual and moral life held on, self-sustained, serene, even felicitous. Its noble habitudes and aims rendered it superior not only to defeat, but even to depression. She was a notable example of the sanative effects of continuous, but prudent, mental labor. She unconsciously expressed the secret of her whole intellectual history when she said, "I wrote because it was impossible for me to be idle." Work is a condition of happiness, and, to a great extent, of health. It is a law of nature. A naturally superior mind, at least, can

never be happy without it, whatever blissful exemption vacant heads may have from the salutary necessity, the divine law. Great capability is always accompanied with an instinct for great work, and a consequent sense of distress in idleness. He that would learn the art of happy and healthy living must learn the art of wisely working, not of overwork, indeed, but equally not of underwork. A good medical authority (Dr. Wilks, of Guy's Hospital) has said :—

> The persons, with unstrung nerves, who apply to the doctor, are not the prime minister, the bishops, judges, and hard-working professional men, but merchants and stock-brokers, retired from business; Government clerks who work from ten to four; women whose domestic duties and bad servants are driving them to the grave; young ladies whose visits to the village school, or Sunday performance on the organ, is undermining their health; and so on. In short, in my experience I see more ailments arise from want of occupation than from overwork; and, taking the various kinds of nervous and dyspeptic ailments which we are constantly treating, I find at least six due to idleness to one from overwork.

The sense of achievement, especially of achieving something useful to others as well as to ourselves, is always an exhilarating, a health-giving consciousness. More effectually than any thing else it expels morbid self-consciousness, and misgiving about the value and results of life. To the thorough worker the so-called "mystery" of life is "an open secret." To him life is probation, and the most obvious condition of that probation is productive, beneficent labor. Most of the wretchedness of human life, at least among men of culture, arises from either the lack of enough to do, or from the misfortune of being wrongly placed in their sphere of activity. The fundamental principle of Goethe's theory of education, as developed in "Wilhelm Meister," that it must be conformed to the natural capabilities, and especially to the natural proclivities of the student, applies equally to his subsequent career; for the latter is a continuous process of self-education for good or evil. To have the heart on the side of one's labor is to undouble the probabilities of success, and to turn labor itself into pleasure.

Mary Somerville had no morbid sensitiveness; she maintained her whole nature in a tranquil, vigorous, wholesome tone by always having something to do. When more than

eighty years old, with a fame that filled the civilized world, she proposed still another great work which would involve the most laborious details of study and research. It was a necessity of her being, one of those necessities which made her life beautiful and blessed. She says:—

I was now unoccupied, and felt the necessity of having something to do, desultory reading being insufficient to interest me; and as I had always considered the section on chemistry the weakest part of the "Connection of Physical Sciences," I resolved to write it anew. My daughters strongly opposed this, saying, "Why not write a new book?" They were right; it would have been lost time. So I followed their advice, though it was a formidable undertaking at my age, considering that the general character of science had greatly changed. By the improved state of the microscope, an invisible creation in the air, the earth, and the water, had been brought within the limits of human vision; the microscopic structure of plants and animals had been minutely studied, and, by synthesis, many substances had been formed of the elementary atoms similar to those produced by nature. Dr. Tyndall's experiments had proved the inconceivable minuteness of the atoms of matter. Mr. Gassiot and Professor Plücher had published their experiments on the stratification of the electric light; and that series of discoveries by scientific men abroad, but chiefly by our own philosophers at home, which had been in progress for a course of years, prepared the way for Bunsen and Kirchhof's marvelous consummation. Such was the field opened to me; but instead of being discouraged by its magnitude, I seemed to have resumed the perseverance and energy of my youth, and began to write with courage, though I did not think I should live to finish even the sketch which I had made. I was now an old woman, very deaf, and with shaking hands. I wrote regularly every morning from eight till twelve or one o'clock, before rising. I was not alone, for I had a mountain sparrow, a great pet, which sat, and, indeed, is sitting on my arm as I write these lines.

When eighty-nine years old she says:—

I have still the habit of studying in bed from eight in the morning till twelve or one o'clock; but I am solitary, for I have lost my little bird, who was my constant companion for eight years.

To a poetically inclined critic her sympathy with the brute creation must appear worthy of special notice as one of her finest traits, and as hardly to be expected in association with her abstract studies and severe mental habits. No mere lady-lounger of the *boudoir* was ever fonder of "pets" than this

student of the most recondite problems of the universe. Her great soul did not disdain to recognize some affinity between itself and the "mountain sparrow" which sat upon her arm, ate from her lips, or watched, through her studious hours, her pen tracing mathematical diagrams which defined the highest mechanism of the heavens. She repeatedly alludes to it with genuine pathos. He says:—

It had both memory and intelligence, and such confidence in me as to sleep upon my arm while I was writing. My daughter, to whom it was much attached, coming into my room early, was alarmed at its not flying to meet her, as it generally did, and at last, after a long search, the poor little creature was found drowned in the jug.

She gathered almost an aviary of such "pets" about her, and their life seemed to enter into her own. She thus writes:—

We are fond of birds, and have several, all very tame. Our tame nightingales sing very beautifully, but, strange to say, not at night. We have also some solitary sparrows, which are, in fact, a variety of the thrush, (*Turdus Cyaneus*,) and some birds which we rescued from destruction in spring, when caught and ill used by the boys in the streets; besides, we have our dogs: all of which afford me amusement and interest.

In her numerous transitions about middle and southern Italy, she speaks of taking with her "our pet birds" as well as "our servants:"—

For I now have a beautiful long-tailed *paroquet*, called Smeraldo, who is my constant companion and is very familiar. And here I must mention how much I was pleased to hear that Mr Herbert, M. P., has brought in a bill to protect land birds, which has been passed in Parliament; but I am grieved to find that the lark, which at heaven's gate sings, is thought unworthy of man's protection. Among the numerous plans for education of the young, let us hope that mercy may be taught as a part of religion.

It was a fine sentiment of humanity that led her thus to sympathize with the lower animals, who share so much our sufferings and so little our reliefs. Italy was, at this time, addicted to atrocious cruelty toward them. It was the only civilized land in Europe that had no law for their protection. For eight years attempts to provide such a law had been defeated. A new attempt was made with which Mrs. Somerville heartily co-operated, signing the petition and urging it

upon the attention of the aristocratic women of the country. It was, indeed, more than a sentiment of humanity; it was a sentiment of religion that prompted her interest for these speechless sufferers. With Wesley, Swedenborg, and many other large-minded as well as large-hearted men, she believed in a future and compensative life for the brute creation—"the creature now made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope," but which, "with the whole creation, groaneth and travaileth in pain together;" "because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God;" "for the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God." It was not only the light, the mystic light, of these intimations of Revelation on the ultimate fate of the living world, that gave Mrs. Somerville sympathetic hope for the lower forms of life; her philosophy sanctioned these sublime utterances. When about to step into the invisible world she says, with deep pathos as well as philosophy:—

We are told of the infinite glories of that state, and I believe in them, though it is incomprehensible to us; but as I do comprehend, in some degree, at least, the exquisite loveliness of the visible world, I confess I shall be sorry to leave it. I shall regret the sky, the sea, with all the changes of their beautiful coloring; the earth, with its verdure and flowers; but far more shall I grieve to leave animals, who have followed our steps affectionately for years, without knowing for certainty their ultimate fate, though I firmly believe that the living principle is never extinguished. Since the atoms of matter are indestructible, as far as we know, it is difficult to believe that the spark which gives to their union life, memory, affection, intelligence, and fidelity, is evanescent. Every atom in the human frame, as well as in that of animals, undergoes a radical change by continual waste and renovation; the abode is changed, not its inhabitant. If animals have no future, the existence of many is most wretched; multitudes are starved, cruelly beaten, and loaded during life; many die under a barbarous vivisection. I cannot believe that any creature was created for uncompensated misery; it would be contrary to the attributes of God's mercy and justice. I am sincerely happy to find that I am not the only believer in the immortality of the lower animals.

It is delightful to trace along minutely so rare, so satisfactory a life, as it tends toward its long-deferred conclusion. When

ninety-one years old she resumes her mathematical studies in some new books which had advanced to higher grounds in algebra, and especially in "quaternions." She writes:—

So now I got exactly what I wanted, and I am very busy for a few hours every morning; delighted to have an occupation so entirely to my mind. I thank God that my intellect is still unimpaired. During the rest of the day I have recourse to Shakspeare, Dante, and more modern light reading, besides the newspapers, which always interested me much. I have resumed my habit of working, and can count the threads of a fine canvas without spectacles. I receive every one who comes to see me, and often have the pleasure of a visit from old friends very unexpectedly. In the evening I read a novel, but my tragic days are over; I prefer a cheerful conversational novel to the sentimental ones. I have recently been reading Walter Scott's novels again, and enjoy the broad Scotch in them. I play a few games of Béziqué with one of my daughters for honor and glory, and so our evenings pass pleasantly enough. It is our habit to be separately occupied during the morning, and spend the rest of the day together.

The next year she writes:—

I am now, in my ninety-second year, (1872,) still able to drive out for several hours. I am extremely deaf, and my memory of ordinary events, and especially of the names of people, is failing, but not for mathematical or scientific subjects. I am still able to read books on the higher algebra for four or five hours in the morning, and even to solve the problems. Sometimes I find them difficult, but my old obstinacy remains, for if I do not succeed today, I attack them again on the morrow. I also enjoy reading about all the new discoveries and theories in the scientific world and on all branches of science.

Her last record, in her last year, is worthy of her whole life:—

Though far advanced in years, I take as lively an interest as ever in passing events. The blue Peter has been long flying at my foremast, and now that I am in my ninety-second year I must soon expect the signal for sailing. It is a solemn voyage, but it does not disturb my tranquillity. Deeply sensible of my utter unworthiness, and profoundly grateful for the innumerable blessings I have received, I trust in the infinite mercy of my almighty Creator. I have every reason to be thankful that my intellect is still unimpaired; and although my strength is weakness, my daughters support my tottering steps, and, by incessant care and help, make the infirmities of age so light to me that *I am perfectly happy.*

This enviable happiness, and also this notable longevity, could probably never have been attained but by such persistent, *practical* life—the habitude of *working on*, which is, in the best sense, *living on*. At the very least this was true in respect to the continued integrity of her mental faculties and her enjoyment of life. She enjoyed life in extreme age, because it was filled up with befitting occupation; she kept her faculties in their integrity, because she kept them in habitual exercise. Labor had become a luxury to her, as it does to all faithful workers. She kept it up to the day of her death, and her death itself was enviable. "My mother," writes her daughter, "died in sleep on the morning of the 29th November, 1872."

The final testimony of her biographer is that her

Old age was a thoroughly happy one. She often said that not even in the joyous spring of life had she been more truly happy. Serene and cheerful, full of life and activity, and as far as her physical strength permitted, she had none of the infirmities of age, except difficulty in hearing, which prevented her from joining in general conversation. She had always been near-sighted, but could read small print with the greatest ease without glasses, even by lamplight. To the last her intellect remained perfectly unclouded; her affection for those she loved, and her sympathy for all living beings, as fervent as ever; nor did her ardent desire for and belief in the ultimate religious and moral improvement of mankind diminish. She always retained her habit of study; and that pursuit in which she had attained such excellence, and which was the most congenial to her—mathematics—delighted and amused her to the end. Her last occupations, continued to the actual day of her death, were the revision and completion of a treatise which she had written years before, on the "Theory of Differences," (with diagrams exquisitely drawn,) and the study of a book on Quaternions. Though too religious to fear death, she dreaded outliving her intellectual powers; and it was with intense delight that she pursued her intricate calculations after her ninetieth and ninety-first years, and repeatedly told me how she rejoiced to find that she had the same readiness and facility in comprehending and developing these extremely difficult *formulæ* which she possessed when young. Often, also, she said how grateful she was to the almighty Father who had allowed her to retain her faculties unimpaired to so great an age. God was, indeed, loving and merciful to her; not only did he spare her this calamity, but also the weary trial of long-continued illness. In health of body and vigor of mind, having lived far beyond the usual span of human life, he called her to himself. For her, death lost all its terrors. Her pure spirit passed away so gently that

those around her scarcely perceived when she left them. It was the beautiful and painless close of a noble and a happy life.

Such was one of the most noteworthy lives in the history of the human race. It is not too much to say so. Its rare length alone would entitle it to be so regarded; its rarer happiness, in old age; its still rarer success in the highest culture; the yet rarer fact of this success by a woman, render it altogether unique and admirable. But its most noteworthy fact, because most instructive and consolatory to us all, is that it was achieved, as we have shown, in the ordinary circumstances, amid the unneglected ordinary duties of our common life.

That all minds, of average capacity, can equal her success it would be presumptuous to affirm; but if not equal, yet similar success is within the reach of all who have the resolution to be equally diligent and persistent. Mary Somerville judged herself very frankly, and she never claimed any thing like genius; she claimed nothing more than an unusual degree of "perseverance." If there was any element of what is called genius in her mental constitution, it must have been of a mathematical character. There are scattered through her writings occasional indications of that insight, that prescient perception of truth, which is usually esteemed genius, but which may, in most cases, be the result of persistent inquiry and through mental discipline. One of the sublimest achievements of science in our age is an illustration of her prophetic faculty in this respect. In 1846 the learned world was startled by the simultaneous announcement, from Adams, of England, and Leverrier, of France, of the demonstration, by mere mathematical calculation, of the existence, size, position in space, and the periodic time, of a hitherto unseen planet, rolling around our system, 3,000,000,000 of miles from the sun. The telescopes of Europe were pointed to the designated place, and the declaration of the two mathematicians was confirmed. Four years before this discovery Mary Somerville had given, in her "Connection of the Physical Sciences," this ever memorable sentence: "If after the lapse of years the tables formed from a combination of numerous observations should be still inadequate to represent the motions of Uranus, the discrepancies may reveal the existence, nay, even the mass and orbit, of a body placed beyond the sphere of vision." This suggestion led one of the

mathematicians at least, (Adams,) perhaps both of them, to calculate the orbit of Neptune. But though this prediction looks like an intimation of genius, Mary Somerville never believed she possessed any such innate power in even the mathematics. In her early studies she complains of unusual difficulties and defects in the simplest calculations. She overcame them only by persevering industry. If she had genius in mathematics, yet it will hardly be claimed for her in other respects; but she was an accomplished naturalist, linguist, *litterateur*, musician, and painter. Her attainments, aside from her knowledge of the abstract sciences, were such as few of her sex have equaled, but they were the results of persistent labor. In these, at least, she is an example for all aspiring minds—a resplendent demonstration of what woman, as well as man, may achieve in self-culture in even the ordinary circumstances of life. None of us should close the review of such a career without an exhilarating sense of the possibilities of his own life, or without the brave determination that henceforth his aims shall be pitched to a loftier flight than ever before.

Art. III.—THE MILLENNIUM AND SECOND ADVENT.

A class of theological writers have of late treated elaborately the millennium and all its attendant circumstances, some of them in this Quarterly. It is noticeable, also, that they have treated it as something specifically defined in the Scriptures, and about which there can be reasonably no essential difference of opinion as to what the millennium is, or its local habitation. Herein, we submit, lies a great fallacy. The premises of this whole argument are assumed; and hence, no reliable conclusion can be reached in reasoning from them. The word millennium is not found in the Scriptures, and, consequently, can have no well-defined Scripture meaning. Therefore, whatever meaning is attached to it must be conventional, and used with the widest latitude to suit all writers on that subject. As might be expected with this open field for speculation, with no biblical meaning of terms agreed upon among theological writers from age to age, in the history of the Church, wide-

ly divergent views have been held about the *nature* of the millennium.

While eschatology involves some things about which Protestant Christians may differ, there is a general agreement that Christ will make his second advent in this world as its final Judge in some unknown future; and also, that prior to that time, according to much sure prophecy, the Gospel of Christ is to accomplish great changes in this world. The two most prevailing opinions are:—

First, That the millennium will consist in a *personal reign of Christ on earth a thousand years*, with the saints raised from the dead, the wicked on earth destroyed or suppressed, and the wicked dead not raised till after this thousand years.

Second, Others, repudiating the above theory, hold that the Scriptures, as a whole, teach that the millennium will be brought about by the spread or growth of Christianity, by the means now and always employed, till the Gospel will become general and predominant in its influence, giving character more or less perfectly to all social and civil institutions, but not wholly destructive of sin and sinners on earth.

It is also held by this latter class, that those strong Scripture expressions which indicate some future time when *all* shall know the Lord—when the earth shall be *full* of the knowledge of the Lord, etc., are to be understood not literally, as exact statements, but, as the Scriptures often speak, in a general sense, showing that the common and prevailing influence will be Christian. It is said the apostles "went every-where preaching the word," not in a literal and exact sense, but in a general sense.

With these and other shades of different opinions respecting the *nature* of that state of things described in inspiration, commonly called "the millennium," it is not a safe method of reasoning for a writer to *assume* that this or that kind of millennium is the biblical one, with no Scripture character of it defined, and then proceed *from the Scriptures* to find its *time* and *place* of location. In determining from prophecy or history when and where to place the millennium, it is a *sine qua non* to know *what* it is. Therefore, that we may start on firm footing, let us as nearly as possible find the Scripture *character* of the millennium, when its *time* and *place* will be more easily found.

A 706211

It will be, therefore, the chief object of this paper to show from the Scriptures, that the state of things there set forth, usually called the millennium, is widely different from what is claimed by the *thousand* years' reign theory, called premillenarianism, and also to show that the proofs of the thousand years' theory are materially insufficient.

We hope to show a different reign of Christ on earth before the resurrection of the dead and the last judgment than that contended for by the premillenarians. Beyond those great epochs the divine records say but little, and in half-suppressed utterances.

Cardinal in this discussion will be the consideration of the *nature* and *extent* of Christ's reign, empire, or rule on earth. Any mistake at this point may prove fatal in our reasoning, as it has, we think, with others.

Though in all ages of the Church there may have been individuals who have held the theory of a thousand years' reign, yet it is evident from the writings of Eusebius, Irenæus, Origen, and others among the ancients, as well as from Dupin and Mosheim in later times, that this theory has never been made an article of established faith in any nation. But we shall not incumber this writing with long lists for and against each of these theories, as we might; for our appeal is not to men, but to God. Nor will the *antiquity* of either view be of any service in the final settlement of the question, as both truth and error are venerable with age, and apparently with alternate success and defeat. That, however, does not bring us necessarily any nearer *Bible* truth. That book, fairly expounded, must be allowed to speak for itself, and can be trusted, indorsed by many or few names. Yet the amount of Scripture quoted amounts to nothing, unless it is *pertinent* and *conclusive.* Mr. Miller, in his original lectures on modern adventism, spake almost wholly in Scripture language, like some late premillenarians, but, as results have shown, in Scripture language *misunderstood* and *misapplied.*

We are not so much impressed with the *conclusiveness* of the late pre-millenarian reasoning as we are with its *assumption.* The sweeping statement, unqualified and positive, that "There is not a single passage of Scripture, literal or symbolical, which treats of the millennium, and its relation to the advent, that teaches, indicates, or in any manner represents the millennium

as *preceding* the advent," indicates a conscious weakness of its own cause, and reminds us much of the bold and reckless assertions of "1843," which have driven their unhappy authors since unto unknown waters!

We are told that "Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wiclif, and Melanchthon all gave expression to convictions which showed that they looked for the advent before the complete subjection of the world to Christ." No doubt; and what Christian writer or minister does not? But, provided these great and good men, as they were, emerging from their long and dense darkness, had indorsed fully the *thousand years'* theory, what would that prove? Did they not hold many opinions which few now venture to proclaim?

The Second Psalm is hurled with great violence against the postmillenarians, because, when it promises the heathen to Christ as his inheritance, it also says, "He shall break them with a rod of iron." This psalm is one of the most direct and positive supports of postmillenarianism; for, as we shall show hereafter, it teaches, in harmony with many other prophecies, that in the on-goings of Christianity the heathen will receive it, and "kings and judges" are warned that their oppressive rule will end by the growth of better governments, growing up by gospel means; and they will be "broken like a potter's vessel." Daniel says of the kingdom of Christ, "It shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Chap. ii, 44. How like the second Psalm this sounds. Scripture must be compared with Scripture if we would know its import.

"His will," it is said, "shall be done on [in] earth." Therefore he (Christ) must reign personally here. Please, by what authority do men tell us God's will shall be done in earth? Inspiration does not say so only in a qualified sense; and if it should ever occur in the distant future, it must be beyond the reign of devils and the "falling away first," that will precede the second advent, and the final judgment which will fix here and there the *tares* and the *scoffers*. And the state of things that lies beyond all that is not now under discussion. It is *assumed*, by a late writer in this Review, that the postmillenarians claim that all sin and sinners will cease, or disappear in the millennium; and then he arrays argument on argument

to overthrow his imaginary foe. No one so contends. Sinners, more or less, and, may be, of the vilest type, will be found here "when He shall appear." Such might, perhaps, be found in all Christian Churches should He come now. But this does not disprove the *general* acceptance of Christianity before "*that day.*" So fails all this splendid array of arguments as against postmillenarianism.

But a greater *farce* in the line of argument can hardly be found, it seems to us, than the attempt to draw from the parable of the wheat and the tares destruction to postmillenarianism and support to premillenarianism. The writer admits enough to spoil his own and support his opponents' theory. He admits that Christ's kingdom is *now* and *here* in this world; he admits that wheat and tares are now and will be here in this world till the end of it. Pray, then, when, where, and what is to be the *thousand years* of Christ's personal reign before the end of the world and before the judgment? Sin and sinners accordingly are to mar that millennium which is after the resurrection, and personal and all-conquering presence of the King of kings and Lord of lords; which will render it no more of a heavenly state than held by postmillenarians *before* the resurrection, and before Christ's second advent. In all this line of argument we have found nothing more conclusive or satisfactory than this style of reasoning and Scripture quotation, strangely loose and without point.

The Old and New Testament use abundantly, as did Christ in his teaching, the symbol of *kingdoms* or kingly rule, to represent the *spiritual* Church on earth which he purchased with his blood, and came to found and carry forward in earth. The figure is striking and powerful, and the analogy in many respects is perfect, but not in all points. But the language employed in these prophecies, and other utterances, is such as to be easily mistaken by the *unspiritual* for a temporal and earthly kingdom. So the Jews very naturally understood it, looking, as they were, for an earthly deliverer, and not a *spiritual* one. The early disciples did not rise above that till after Christ's resurrection and the gift of the Holy Ghost. How much modern adventists and premillenarians are influenced by other than lofty *spiritual* conceptions of Christianity does not become us to judge. But it is worthy of notice that.

Christ's kingdom on earth for eighteen hundred years has not developed itself into any thing of a temporal or political kind; and there is just as little prospect it ever will, only as it will indirectly do so by its own inherent growth of Christian principles. When the Founder said, "My kingdom is not of this world," he said it for all time, and in the purest and most lofty sense. Yet the poisonous interventions and intermeddlings of groveling *man* would spoil all the architecture of our hopes of the highest heaven, not made with hands.

Let us now patiently turn our attention to what the Scriptures say about Christ's *reign* or *kingdom* on earth.

The absolute dominion and sovereignty of God over all worlds need not now be discussed, though it should be sublimely contemplated. But the *kingdom of God and kingdom of heaven*, used synonymously, as ordinarily occurring in inspiration, bring to our view quite another subject, namely, *the reign of Christ over the hearts or affections of his creatures in earth and heaven.* This kingdom he came to establish and extend by his sufferings and mediations. Beyond doubt, Isaiah prophesies of Christ when he says: "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment." Isa. xxxii, 1. So also of the psalmist, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. . . . Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Psa. ii, 6–8. According to the prophecy of Daniel, this kingdom of Christ was to be established, or set up, during the existence of the Roman empire, the last of the four great monarchies that succeeded each other according to that prophecy. He says: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Dan. ii, 44. No more remarkable prophecy of Christ and his work has been left on record. It not only fixes, approximately, the time of his advent, but also the character and accomplishment of his kingdom, sweeping through the entire probation of time from the days of Herod, who whet his steel to destroy the infant Jesus, till the latter-day glory, when he shall be King of kings and Lord of lords, in the sense that the principles of his empire

will be the governing principles of earth. "Herod was greatly troubled because of him;" and so are all now in authority who rule in "spiritual wickedness in high places." Already this growing, conquering kingdom has broken in pieces many wicked Governments, while others are tottering to their final fall. This is being done, not primarily, by the trembling of continents under the tramp of armies, but by the spreading light and truth of Christ, making, first, darkness visible and sin apparent, when strife and revolution follow. The wars of earth, and particularly of the Christian era, have had their origin largely in the resistance of moral evil to the advancing, conquering religion of the meek and lowly Jesus, and, as a result, the wrath of man has been made to advance still faster the empire of Christ. This work of demolition and disintegration was never so apparent on all sides of earth as it is today. All Governments are beginning to trim their sails to the new and heavenly breezes, or going under when the tempest comes. Home and foreign missions are a chief instrumentality. Nor did the prophet's vision fail till he exclaimed: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool." Jeremiah (xxxi, 10) caught the inspiration, and cries: "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock." Christ, to prepare us for what should come before his second advent, said to his disciples: "Ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass; but the end is not yet." How literal, secular, warlike and revolutionary, all this sounds. How these words must have rung out in an age symbolic and non-spiritual, and in ears unused to words of *spirit* and *truth*. Yet "the Captain of our salvation" is "the Prince of peace;" and all wars that come as the results of his kingdom are only such as Satan fought in heaven and in Eden—a simple resistance of goodness. Doubtless all will agree that our description of Christ's kingdom, drawn in the foregoing passages, refers only to the kingdom on earth—a *spiritual* dominion over the *hearts* of mankind; the same kingdom of which the Founder said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Where, then, is the

biblical description of, or allusion to, any kingdom of his that is secular, worldly, and personal on earth? After we have seen the sad and fatal mistake of the Jews in *literalizing* and *secularizing* the reign of Christ, until they have judged themselves unworthy of eternal life, is it not strange that we should swing back through the *spiritual* life and power of Christianity for eighteen hundred years, and seek to take the Son of man by force and make him an earthly king?

But when we come to the New Testament expressions respecting his kingdom, how wholly incompatible they are with anything earthly and secular: "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" "Seek ye first the kingdom of God;" "And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand;" "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven;" "But whosoever shall do and teach them, [the commandments,] the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven;" "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven;" "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily, I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven;" "The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed;" "Like unto leaven, which a woman took," etc. Page after page of such Scripture utterances, *all* showing that the kingdom of Christ, now and here, is, when fairly construed, *invariably* used only in a spiritual sense in the *hearts* of men; and nothing can be more foreign and forced than any idea of his *literal* and *personal* reign at any time on earth. Yet he said to Pilate that he *was a king:* but in what sense, these quotations, and a hundred others given, but not here used, show beyond all possible mistake. This, too, is the sense in which the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, less corrupt and wicked, and running more on the divine principles, because *the people* will have become Christ-like. The *teachings* of Christ, now spreading, will ultimately give him this rule, rather than his taking again our flesh to come here and make himself "a divider among men." The soul revolts from such an idea of the exalted and enthroned Son of God, now in waiting to receive

those for whom he has prepared a better place, beyond all further strife with Satan, who is now being conquered inch by inch, and will be destroyed by the brightness of his coming in the clouds of heaven to judge the world at the end of human probation.

This is the kingdom which it is said "shall never be destroyed," "shall not be left to other people," "shall stand forever." To this Ancient of days were given "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." Dan. vii, 13, 14.

How strangely incongruous and foreign to the general moral significance of these sublime teachings of Scripture, is the theory, that at Christ's second coming he will only hold a limited and temporary reign *in person* among his saints, the wicked unraised, no judgment had, no rewards given, no final adjustment of earth's affairs.

It is important to notice that this kingdom is spoken of in all its stages, from its setting up, its mustard-seed-like commencement, on earth, in its extension through the ages, till the king shall say to those on the right hand, Come, ye blessed, and to those on his left hand, Depart, ye cursed. No note of time nor rate of progress are mentioned—simply the *facts*, the *mode*, and the *results* are stated, and some single passages contain all these in one.

The universal authority of Christ as God and judge of men, and the sense in which he holds now, as always, in his hands the destinies of all nations, with his *spiritual* kingdom now and prospectively, are beautifully and compactly set forth, *multum in parvo*, by Richard Watson in his comments on Luke i, 32, 33, which will be appreciated by the intelligent reader:—

> David was a typical character; and the dominion he acquired, which was to the full extent of the original grant of Canaan made to Abraham, and is expressed by the terms "from sea to sea, and from the river [Euphrates] unto the end of the earth," was a type of the universal dominion of Messiah, when "all kings shall serve him, and all nations shall call him blessed." The application of the characters of David's kingdom in an enlarged meaning, to that of the Messiah, by the prophets, shows that the one was regarded as the emblem or type of the other. But there was another reason why the Messiah was represented as the successor to David's throne. It was a part of the covenant made with David, that he should not want a man to sit upon his throne: "His

seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever, and as a faithful witness in heaven." But a higher throne than the national throne of Israel was intended; even the throne of all nations, to which our Lord has succeeded. For the kingdom of Christ is twofold. It is that spiritual dominion exercised over the wills and affections of men, by moral influence by which they subject themselves to his laws and authority; and it is that exercise of external government over the world, vested in our Lord as mediator, by which, both by mercies and judgments, by the ordering of its changes, the succession of its empires, the destruction of human power, the punishment of persecutors, the destruction of enemies, the determination of the times, places, and influence of knowledge, and inventions of art, commerce, and the intercourse of the different parts of the world, his great designs as to the moral recovery of all nations, and the universal establishment of the empire of his birth, in all its righteous and peaceful influences shall be effected. In this respect he is the King of the Jews, as well as other nations; for though that people are dispersed and denationalized, it is by an act of his severity, and can continue no longer than he wills; and to this power, as the divine sovereign of Israel, is added "all power in heaven and earth." That a descendant of David should enter upon this universal sovereignty and wield its scepter forever, was, indeed, the most signal honor which could be conferred upon his "house," and most amply fulfilled the terms of the promise. As to POWER, the dominion of Christ is now universal; and as to GRACE, the type shall be realized ultimately; and in the visible administration of his Gospel, purifying and softening all the institutions of society, Christ shall reign, the universal Lord, "from the river to the end of the earth." Then shall be accomplished the word of Zechariah, "The Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one: then the theocracy shall be universally acknowledged; all earthly rulers confessing themselves to be but vice-kings and servants of him who is King of kings and Lord of lords.

Singularly enough, Plato, in his description of the judgment which takes place in the invisible state, represents the judge as assigning the "right hand" to the just, and the left hand to the unjust, in the same *kingly* style and authority claimed by our Lord himself.

We should be taught by the *history*, Jewish and Christian, of the advent, incarnation, and kingdom of Christ. Here we learn who have been mistaken, and how it happened. Prophecy *did* represent Christ, or the Messiah, as a Prince, with the highest majesty and power, on whose shoulder should be the government; coming to occupy the throne of David, and over-

throwing all his enemies. His power to restore the Jewish nation was represented as irresistible. The fondness of their desire of such a restoration was in proportion to their suffering and degradation under Roman oppression. This expectation was not confined to Jews, nor to Palestine: the wise men of the East were on their way to greet his coming. Prophecy had foretold his harbinger in truly kingly style. Elijah was expected before him. Yet the Baptist did not know he was himself the personage. Is it strange that they misunderstood those prophecies? Worldly and *non-spiritual* as they were, with no knowledge of any spiritual religion, it is not. Their fatal misinterpretation of prophecy grew largely out of their general worldliness—the dangerous proclivity of the Church in all ages. Yet there were then, as now and always, some *spiritual* and devout persons, like old Simeon and Anna, who have waited and worshiped in true expectation. So deep was this misconception of Christ's kingdom that the *converted* Jews could hardly give it up, and the disciples never did, till after the resurrection. And even after that we hear them asking him: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" and the two on their sad journey to Emmaus, saying, "But we trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel."

From the powerful epistles of St. Paul, we learn that these secular, *literal*, and worldly views of Christianity greatly corrupted the early Christian Church and fathers, touching a *personal*, and even an *immediate*, reign of Christ on earth. Many of these fathers taught that Christ's second advent would occur in their day. Clement of Rome, the fellow-laborer of Paul, it is said, "did hourly expect the kingdom of God." Nor were these views derived wholly from their interpretation of the prophecies. In the "Quarterly Review," 1843, July number, Dr. Whedon shows, by a most conclusive argument from history, that during the captivity the Jews imbibed, more or less, ideas from Zoroaster and other sources, of a chiliastic character, that were at length traditionally bequeathed to the early Christian Church, with many other crudities not taught by the inspired apostles; and he concludes that "chiliasm is a rabbinical, or rather Babylonian, Judaism, transferred into the Christian Church." The tendency of humanity has always been to

becloud or sink the sublime spiritual realities of divine things, from *spirit* to letter, from form to skepticism. And such are the driftings of large portions of the Church of to-day. "The *letter* killeth."

We now propose to show that the Scriptures do not support the view of *such* a millennium as the premillenarians hold.

We have already said the word millennium is not found in Scripture, and hence it is a word invented to describe a certain state of things supposed to be taught in the Scriptures: and to this we have no objection, only allow each to be his own judge *what* that *Scripture* state of things is, and not *assume*, because some have so used the word, that it meant what it cannot be shown the Bible teaches. Nothing, then, can be more important and cardinal, than for us to find as nearly as possible what the Scriptures *do teach*, as to the final state of things on earth under the Gospel dispensation. To this we now call attention. Then we shall give our view of what the millennium is, if the reader prefers that term.

That we may keep the precise point before our minds without waste of words, we will attempt to support this PROPOSITION: That Christianity, before the second advent, before the resurrection, and before the final judgment, is to spread and prevail on earth—though sin and violence will also more or less prevail—producing great changes and revolutions, until it shall become the *prevailing earthly influence.*

It will not be doubted, that among the many Old Testament Scriptures the following embrace in their general significance the whole gospel dispensation, and are now being fulfilled. And these being the strongest passages found descriptive of good ever to occur on earth before the end of time, let it be carefully noted how they prove that the Gospel will prevail by its ordinary means, and become general at least in the earth, without showing it will extirpate all sin, or sinners, before the end; or that the righteous dead will be raised before this state of great religious prosperity; or even hinting that Christ will appear *in person* during the same.

"So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, it shall accomplish that which I please." Isa. lv, 11. What does God please respecting his word? That it shall be preached in all the world by a living

ministry, and that all shall be saved by it who will accept it on his terms—all whose faith comes by *hearing*. It will yet be so preached, for the sure word of prophecy never fails.

"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Psa. ii, 8. Such is the Father's promise to his well beloved Son, and it was never in more rapid process of fulfillment than at this hour. But it is objected that it is also said in this connection, "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel." Truly: and this harmonizes with our proposition, and with much other Scripture, namely, that this Gospel preached in heathen or pagan lands will make sin and oppression visible, and a struggle will follow between light and darkness, and war and bloodshed will be, as has been the result of increasing light, as the only possible way, as things are, to progress and reform. "It must needs be that offenses come." The voices of Scripture and history teach alike on this subject. This is the sense in which Christ came, not to send peace on earth, but a sword. Hence, Christ, in answer to a question about his second coming and the end of the world, said, "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet." Matt. xxiv, 4–6. Then follows a most terrific description of the persecution, false prophets, revolution, and bloodshed, which will accompany the spread of his Gospel in the last (or later) days. Here was the misleading and fatal mistake of modern adventists: these wars and rumors of wars they took as the signs of Christ's *immediate* coming, which he made the sure event to *precede* the coming, *without indicating any length of time which should occur between those two great epochs.* These events were to be the *results* of gospel extensions. On that one mistake, more than any other, was founded the great delusion that has in our own day caused the shipwreck of so many honest, but mistaken souls. Many on the discovery of their error have, with Christian meekness and modesty, renounced it, and returned to their former Christian belief and Christian homes in the Churches; others persist in being *repeatedly* deceived.

Directly to the same point of the last quotation is the prophecy of Daniel, already quoted for another purpose: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Dan. ii, 44. Here Christianity is represented as a *kingdom*, everlasting, aggressive, and conquering kingdom, destructive to its opposites. Such, too, has been its record in its onward march, and what shall prevent its consummation?

"For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Hab. ii, 14. Nothing short of a very *general* spread of Christianity at least, can be said to fulfill this prophecy.

The prophecies are very specific, that both Jews and Gentiles, in the future—dateless, it may be—shall be alike sharers in the gospel successes; for when "the fullness of the Gentiles is come in," then "the blindness in part which has happened unto Israel" will, no doubt, through Gentile missionary labors, give place to "the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." For "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name," says God, "shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." Mal. i, 11. Christianity is not to be a failure in this world, however many individuals may fail to profit by it, and make it to themselves a savor of death unto death.

Carefully note now what is promised to *Israel:* "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock." Jer. xxxi, 10. "For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." Ezek. xxxvi, 24, 25. That the prophecy that foretold that Israel should be scattered has been most palpably and literally fulfilled, their history attests. The descendants of Benjamin and Judah alone may be traced and counted by millions, from seven to ten, *scattered* in every

nation, and speaking every language under heaven. What impious unbelief, then, is that which doubts that these sons of Abraham will, in the ongoings of Christ's kingdom, be *gathered!* "The Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left . . . and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth." Isa. xi, 11, 12. "Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth." Jer. xxxi, 8. "Thou shalt yet plant vines upon the mountains of Samaria." Jer. xxxi, 5. "And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." Amos ix, 15. Thus abundant proof is found in both Testaments that these sons of Abraham will, in considerable numbers, at least, in some unknown future return to the faith of Abraham, and probably to the land given to Abraham and his seed forever, from which they have been driven for their infidelity. It were easy to multiply these quotations, equally clear and pointed. And while they show that the kingdom of Christ has not yet accomplished its full victories, but surely will, they do not indicate *any personal* reign of his on earth. The Hebrew Scriptures are as silent as night on the subject of a thousand years' personal reign, or any other support of the premillennium theory. And though they speak as repeatedly and fully of the spread and empire of Scripture holiness, they say nothing in conflict with the teachings, especially of the New Testament, that sinners, wicked men, and seducers will wax worse and worse, as the result of their ripened iniquity, and that a falling away of Christians too will yet occur. Dr. Schaff says: "The preaching of the Gospel through the Roman world preceded the end of the Jewish state; and the preaching of the Gospel through the *whole* world will be the sign of the end of the *aion outos.*"

Alford says: "The apostasy of the latter days, and the universal dispersion of missions, are the two signs of the end drawing near."

The New Testament is as explicit and direct in setting forth the world-wide spread of Christianity, and as silent of any personal earthly reign of Christ.

The language of the original commission of the ministry by

its Author is significant: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Mark xvi, 15. Twice the universality of this Gospel and its preaching is alluded to in these few and condensed words: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Acts i, 8. All true ministers of Christ to the end of time are included in these promises. "And this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. xxiv, 14. These remarkable words of Christ were in answer to the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" What could be plainer, or more conclusive? On this passage, Dr. Whedon has the following appreciative and judicious remarks:—

Gospel of the kingdom—The doctrines of Messiah's universal kingdom. *Shall be preached in all the world*—In all nations, and thereby the Messiah's universal kingdom become universally acknowledged. Mark says the Gospel must be published among all nations. It is certainly difficult to study these various phrases, *Gospel of the kingdom in all the world—unto all nations—among all nations*, without seeing the necessity of bringing them into association with those many texts which describe the conversion of the world to Christianity. Certainly the narratives of the travels of the apostles into distant countries, as late tradition has specified, are too scanty, if not too apocryphal, to be quoted as the fulfillment of this verse. *For a witness*—Witness that all men might believe. John i, 7. Our Lord does not here say, as some construe his words, that the Gospel shall be preached for a witness *against* all nations, but *to* all nations. Assuredly God does not send the Gospel to increase men's condemnation. This would make it intentionally the *poison* rather than the *bread* of life. *Then shall the end come*—What end? Unless our Lord answered very deceptively, he meant the end about which they inquired, namely, the end of the world. Nor is it of the slightest consequence to argue that our Lord here does not say that all the world will be converted, and that its conversion will last a long mundane period. To describe the millennium is not his purpose. He alludes to it, in order to show his disciples that the tribulation of the destruction of Jerusalem is not the tribulation of the judgment; for the predestined universal spread of the Gospel stands between them. The millennium first, and then the second advent.

We may also add that there is a sort of perspective in proph-

ver. The nearer event, as in a painting, is drawn full size, but the more distant dwindles to a point. See note on xxiii, 39.

On the whole, perhaps, all this paragraph is clear. Commotions and persecutions shall come, but these are not the tokens of the END. On the contrary, you shall be preserved from their power, that you may secure that universal Gospel diffusion for which the Church is founded and suffers, and which lies between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world.

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign [not a thousand years] for ever and ever." Rev. xi, 15. How will these earthly kingdoms have become the kingdoms of Christ? By these earthly kings, emperors, and presidents stepping down and out, and Jesus Christ in human form and person stepping in, for a thousand years, and literally taking up the details of administration of governmental offices? The very thought is as antagonistic to Scripture teaching as it is to a pure and lofty *spirituality*. On this the late unique and lamented Bishop Thomson has these pungent remarks:—

> The misinterpretation of the kingly character of Christ, resulting from national pride, was the reason why Jesus so gradually revealed his claims to the Jews. . . . This false view of Christ's kingly office, which caused the Jewish nation to reject him, is taken by those who expect him, at his second coming, to establish a civil government, and to reign personally on the earth. Is it not a lowering of our conception of his character to suppose him occupying a limited throne, using a copper seal, wearing a golden crown; to suppose Paul acting as Secretary of War; Peter as Secretary of the Navy; the beloved disciple, as Secretary of State; Matthew, counting his coin, as Secretary of the Treasury; Bartholomew, among the mail-bags, bargaining with contractors; St. James, superintending the revenue, and revising the tariff; Luke, the beloved physician, drawing sword at the head of the army? Is this our idea of the King of kings, after eighteen hundred years of Christian progress? And are such to be the employments of apostles, after eighteen centuries in glory?
>
> It was such a kingdom as this that Judas wanted in which to display his financial talents, and such a one that the devil desired our Lord to establish. In his last temptation he points to the world and all its kingdoms, and their glory, as they appear to him who knows all things, and says, in effect, to Christ: You are come a king; the Jews expect you to make David's throne that of the world; comply with their expectations; cast in your

lot with me, for I have possession. With my control over mind, and yours over matter, nothing can stand in the way of your universal dominion. Only let *my* authority be undisputed in the *temple*, and *yours* shall be unquestioned in the *field* and the *cabinet*. The spiritual course, which you have marked out for yourself, is one of darkness and distress. I will resist you even unto death.—*Evidences of Revelation*, pp. 259, 260.

Yet Jesus is a King; this he admitted when interrogated by Pilate: but in a far more exalted sense than premillenarians claim. Though the people clamored for it, and attempted by force to make him an earthly king, his whole life, ministry, and teaching declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." His *throne* is the great *heart* of the universe—earth and heaven. For want of space we omit more than half our Scripture selections on this part of our subject. But enough are given. It is remarkable that the premillenarians rely almost wholly on one passage of Scripture to support this theory, even though their exposition of that passage does so much violence to the *general* teaching of the Bible. *Such* a violation of the laws of interpretation renders it possible to make the Scriptures support any absurdity imaginable. Once admit their method of expounding a *figurative* passage, and we can sail into any port on the sea of inspiration. This passage is their chief reliance: "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." Rev. xx, 4, 5.

A surface survey of this passage would seem to support their theory, if we allow certain points to be *assumed*. But a critical exegesis of the passage spoils its whole force for that purpose. It is like the whole book of Revelation, highly symbolical, and often of very doubtful interpretation, and hence very unsuitable to *found* any theory upon, and even to *support* a theory, except one that is well sustained by other Scripture proofs. The interpretation given to this passage in support of the premillenarian views is not only *unsustained* by other passages,

but often and powerfully *confronted* and overthrown by them! Such a use of this passage is reckless and unscholarly. The leading terms of the text are doubtful, at least, and evidently not to be understood literally—*I saw the souls.* Literally, *souls* are not seen—cannot be seen; being immaterial, they are invisible. It is not said that these souls were reclothed with their long-since mutilated bodies, nor is it said those *bodies* were raised at all. Hence, it must be admitted there is something in this passage *figurative* or *symbolic*, for it cannot be *literally* true. Therefore, what is more natural or more probable than that the *living again*, or *re*-living, is the reappearance on earth of the *spirit*, or moral *status*, or Christian heroism of the old martyrs? The *spirit* of the martyrs, once driven from earth to heaven by violence, will reappear, or rise up on earth, before the resurrection of bodies, and *will reign* with Christ in his *spiritual* kingdom, which then will have "broken in pieces and consumed all these [other] kingdoms;" for His "is an everlasting kingdom," and in some glorious sense the righteous shall yet inherit the earth, under the growth and triumph of his kingdom that *was*, that *is*, and is *to be*. The resurrection of *souls* is not used in Scripture; nor is the resurrection of *bodies* ever indicated by the use of the word *soul*, or *souls*, in any other Scripture. By what rule of exegesis, then, is it pressed into that meaning here? The term *souls* must, therefore, be used here in some uncommon sense: why, then, may not the term "lived and lived again" be used in some uncommon sense also? Such an interpretation only makes Scripture teaching harmonious on this subject. There is no mention of *bodies* or *flesh* in this passage at all.

More: *Resurrection* does not always mean in Scripture resurrection of *body*. "I am the resurrection and the life," said Christ. "And I will raise him up at the last day," is spoken of as something peculiar to the righteous, while the Bible represent the good and bad alike as rising from the dead. "So, also, is the resurrection of the dead," describes the heavenly state. Likewise, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage." *The resurrection* means often in Scripture something besides the resurrection of the body; why, then, may it not here, (if it is implied at all,) especially when such an interpretation better harmonizes the Bible? A

spiritual rather than physical state is often thus indicated; so it is in this passage in Revelation.

Our view of this probable meaning of the passage in question is much strengthened by the argument, *reductio ad absurdum.* The absurd consequences which follow the view of it taught by premillenarians are many, and very apparent.

If Christ is to make his second advent immediately after the distruction of antichrist, up to which time the saints will be persecuted and oppressed, *when* and *where* are they to enjoy that rest and prosperity so abundantly promised them, as we have above shown, which will take place *before* his coming? These two described states of things cannot exist together. Which now shall we do: set aside all our Scripture proofs here given of the future spread and triumph of the Gospel, or set aside this strange premillenarian interpretation of the passage?

This coming of Christ, as is represented, separates the *advent* from the day of judgment at least "a thousand years," which is against the uniform Scripture representation, where these two events are nearly always associated. When He will come again to earth it will be to judge the world, and no intimations are given that any time is to elapse between those events. "I charge thee before the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." "Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all." "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day." These Scriptures and their parallels read quite differently, from the assertion that the rest of the dead—meaning dead bodies—lived not again till a thousand years *after* His *coming.* It adds to the absurdity of this theory, also, that nothing is said in this passage of *his coming* at all, in any sense—personal or otherwise. Professor Duffield says:—

> The Greek word *parousia* has a fixed and definite meaning peculiar to indicate *Christ's coming*, but is not the word ordinarily meaning *to come*, and is a term which denotes as precisely as

possible by any single word, *personal presence.* And in seventeen cases out of eighteen in our Scriptures this term is used to denote his second coming to judgment.*

But it is noticeable that this *parousia* does not occur in the favorite and almost solitary passage of premillenarians, nor, indeed, is there any other term in this passage intimating Christ's coming—or any reigning, except as he reigns now, only more generally and perfectly.

The Greek term *parousia*, used to indicate the *coming of Titus*, 2 Cor. vii, 6; the personal "bodily presence" of Paul, 2 Cor. x, 10; "the coming of Stephanas," 1 Cor. xvi, 17; "my coming to you again," Phil. i, 26; "the promise of *his coming*," 2 Peter iii, 4,† and many other cases we might quote, is used where a *personal presence* or *coming* is taught. How strange, then, that in this famous passage, if it was intended to teach the *second personal coming*, or advent of Christ, this nearly uniform term used for that porpose is here omitted! Every presumption lies against such a supposition. Much other plain and direct Scripture would be required to overcome this argument from this omission.

Then the view that Satan, *after* the second advent, is to be loosed, and gather armies and go forth to fight battles (Gog and Magog) against the Lord and his people, is repugnant to the whole significance of inspiration. When Christ the judge shall come devils will be awed into silence, waiting their awful doom in the fire prepared for them. "That Wicked" will have his day and battles *before* Christ comes, "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his *coming*." 2 Thess. ii, 8. Then and there the conqueror of the wilderness and Joseph's new tomb will deliver up His *mediatorial* kingdom, and he whose right it is will *reign* in heaven, earth, and hell, and fight no more battles in the flesh with his long since conquered enemy.

On this passage (Rev. xx, 4) Dr. Adam Clarke says: "I am satisfied that this period [a thousand years] should not be taken literally. It may signify that there shall be a long and undisturbed state of Christianity; and so universally shall the gospel spirit prevail, that it will appear as if Christ reigned upon

* Professor Duffield's "Discourse on the Second Advent," p. 24.

† See "Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament."

earth; which will in effect be the case, because his spirit shall rule in the hearts of men. . . . As to the term 'thousand years,' it is a mystic number among the Jews." The binding of Satan a thousand years, and his being then loosed, he continues: "These can be only symbolic representations, utterly incapable of the sense usually put upon them."

Mr. Wesley says of these thousand years, "The danger does not lie in maintaining that the thousand years are yet to come, but in interpreting them, whether past or to come, in a gross and carnal sense."

The "Pocket Commentary" says of the thousand years, "As seven mystically implies universality, so a thousand implies *perfection*, whether in good or evil. *Thousand* symbolizes that the world is perfectly leavened by the Divine. . . . Then shall our present defective governments give place to perfect governments in both Church and State." Such might well be called a *reign* of Christ. This, too, is a common form of Scripture representation—a *personality* used to represent the *spirit* of events. "I am the resurrection and the life," said Christ: meaning, that he is the author of that state.

"Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," said Malachi; language which the Baptist himself did not understand, though he was that very Elias. The prophet of Horeb reappeared on earth before Christ only in the rough, honest, and lofty *spirit* of him who was "the voice of one crying in the wilderness."

Christ will reign, not in the flesh and in person, but in spirit and in power; not literally one thousand years, but an indeterminate and perfect season; while sin and Satan will be comparatively bound, checked, pushed to the rear, but not destroyed before the judgment. For there will be sin, intensified it may be, but less general, till Christ comes.

In like manner the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus will reappear on earth, or be seen only as the *spirit* of the martyrs; for nothing is said of their bodies which would be essential to their being *seen*. If our readers will examine carefully the point, they will be impressed with the uniform representation in Scripture, that all human probation occurs *this side* of the second advent, as well as this side

of the resurrection and judgment-day. Not a passage is known to us that speaks differently. Those three great and solemn events are placed at the end of this world and state, and are introductory to the next world, which is always treated as a world of *retribution* only. These events, though sometimes treated separately by inspired writers, are usually spoken of as occurring at the same time, and are *never* represented as occurring at periods *remote* from each other. The numerous Scripture quotations we have here given for other purposes are equally in point to prove this.

The *spirit* of martyrdom is here set forth as a model of what will be in earth, and what is sure to share the first consideration and honor of the blessed Master in this world and the world to come. But what a gross and groveling thought, that these martyrs are to leave their heavenly abode and reward, to come back to our earth, with flesh and bones, to work out another probation in conflict with their already conquered foe! And how little Scripture support, when the few passages claimed come under a close analysis, and the use of those few betraying the usual and fatal blunder of looking at the *letter* rather than the *spirit* of Scripture—the great error of the pharisaical doctors before Christ, as they so expounded the law and the prophets as to mislead and overthrow their nation. "The letter killeth," now as then.

There are other difficulties, *absurdities* even, in the premillennium theory, as compared with Scripture teaching generally. That theory assails the Bible doctrine of the close of *probation* before the second advent. But for this one passage, and its careless and non-spiritual construction, who would have gathered the first hint from Bible reading that believers would be raised from the grave a thousand years before Christ should leave his mediatorial throne, enjoying their reward with him here on earth before the judgment-day! Equally absurd is the supposition that the resurrection of the dead, so generally spoken of in connection with the last judgment, is the resurrection of the *wicked* only, when the Scriptures name the righteous and the wicked in the one and only resurrection of human bodies ever spoken of there. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii, 2. "Marvel not

at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John v, 28, 29. "And I saw the dead, small and great, [meaning all the dead,] stand before God; and the books were opened," etc. Rev. xx, 12. These, and many other passages, place the resurrection of all men, good and bad, at one time, and connect the same immediately with the future and general judgment; and how *unlike* all the teachings of premillenarians is obvious.

What a jar is felt all through God's moral universe by that necessitated supposition, that in or after Christ's supreme earthly reign of a thousand years, in a resurrection and heavenly state with his dear children, *Satan* is loosed, and renews his raids on God's empire! We can much sooner believe that last and spasmodic effort of Satan will occur in this probationary state of Christianity than after its close, and the redeemed have worn their crowns a *thousand years.*

The wheat and tares will grow together till the end—scoffers also will be here till the last, and in many respects, "as the days of Noah were, so shall the coming of the Son of man be." Apostasies and "a falling away" have occurred ever and anon among men and angels ever since probation began, and what reason have we to doubt they will continue, more or less, till probation ends? It will be so as long as humanity remains unglorified in heaven. Wicked men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, while he that hath clean hands shall grow stronger and stronger, is philosophical as it is scriptural.

This apostasy, prophecied of, may be special and brief, or only occasional, as now and always, or otherwise; but in any event it will be limited by the judgment. But all that does not show that sin, or apostasy, will be the *general* order of things in the *last days*, any more than in the wheat field the *tares* shall be the *prevailing* product. Revelation does not particularize these events, they are there only outlined. But if the Conqueror of death and hell is to submit himself to another combat with Satan, and subject all the righteous dead to a thousand years of warfare with the prince of darkness, Calvary and Olivet are robbed of their transcendent glory, and all the army of the living God is covered with sackcloth; and

we all grow chill as we think of the children of the resurrection and immortality coming back to mingle long ages in the vileness of this mundane system. This necessarily brief examination of so many-sided a subject suggests the great danger of construing one or a few passages of Scripture in a way that conflicts with the significance of inspiration as a whole, and especially where so many cardinals in Bible doctrines are connected, as with this subject. Holy Scripture does not conflict with itself; and if we, by our exposition, force that result, so much the worse for our exposition.

Nor can we divest ourself of the conviction, in tracing the arguments and expositions of the premillennium advocates, that they show what has been apparent in all ages of the Church, a ruinous tendency to *lower* the *status* of Christianity from its lofty spiritual verity to the secular and ritual. "God is a *Spirit*," and so is Christianity, and not a tangible and palpable substance. But *man* "is of the earth, earthy," and he degrades all that he touches which is above himself. By this means the ancient Jews counted themselves out of Christ's *spiritual* kingdom. A *literal* king or none, they cried. Thus, too, the modern adventists, because they loved and courted the speedy appearing of the Son of man, seizing and torturing a few Scriptures, have struck out blindly for unknown seas, and now steer wilder and wilder amid the rocks and quicksands incident to their honest, but rash mistake in the outset. They remind us of Cicero, in his treatise of Old Age, where he represents the elder Cato as holding opinions of which he was *fond*, rather than such as he could *demonstrate*.

If, as we think, premillenarianism serves to weaken our confidence in Christianity and its achievements, showing it to be, prospectively, a comparative failure, furnishing but little hope to the far-off regions yet in the shadow of death, and no hope of the resurrection of our race, except one long deferred; the view we have here set forth fills us with confidence, faith, and zeal for the world's salvation, breathing power and efficiency into all our home and foreign missionary work, *faith* to prayers, and strength to our uplifted hands. "This *Gospel* of the *kingdom* shall be preached in all the world."—*Christ.*

Art. IV.—OF THE PECULIARITIES OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.*

The Pastoral Epistles form one of the most difficult problems in isagogical and exegetical theology. This is evident, first, from the fact that so many theologians, eminent alike for their profound scholarship, patient research, and critical skill, have arrived at different conclusions in reference to their authorship, the time and place of their composition, their style and contents; and, secondly, from the existence of an immense literature on the subject. Certain it is that they contain many important passages in regard to the doctrine of the person of Christ, his redemptive work and mediatorial office, the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures, the fall and redemption of man, regeneration, etc. Nor is it to be overlooked that, besides many practical suggestions as to personal piety and church discipline, they afford us a deep insight not only into the intimate personal relations that existed between the great Apostle to the Gentiles and his colaborers, but into the state and condition of the Apostolic Church as well. The simplicity of the latter forms a striking contrast to the complex constitution and preposterous assumptions of the Roman Catholic Church.

And yet the genuineness of these epistles has been repeatedly and severely attacked, especially in modern times. Schleiermacher† opened the attack by declaring the first Epistle to Timothy to be a miserable compilation from the other two; while Eichhorn,‡ De Wette,§ and T. C. Baur,‖ maintained that all three epistles are historically and exegetically incomprehensible; and a host of smaller critics followed in their footsteps. De Wette, however, admitted that they are as well attested by external or historical evidences as the

* See an article on the same subject, by Chaplain Steinwenden, in the February and March (1875) numbers of "*Der Beweis des Glaubens*," to which we are indebted for much that is valuable in the present article.

† *Ueber den Sogenannten Ersten Brief an Timotheus*, (1807.)

‡ *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, (1824–27.)

§ *Lehrbuch der Histor. Krit. Einleitung in die Kanon. Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (1826–17.)

‖ *Die Sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostle's Paulus aufs Neue Kritisirt*, (1835) and *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, (1845–66.)

other epistles of St. Paul. True, there have not been wanting many strong and able defenders of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles. Among them may be mentioned Bleek,* M. Baumgarten,† Wiesinger,‡ Heydenreich,§ Matthies,‖ Wieseler,¶ Van Oosterzee,** Guericke,†† Reuss,‡‡ Huther,§§ Conybeare and Howson,‖‖ Lewin,¶¶ Whedon,*** besides most of the English commentators on the New Testament. Others, like Professor Scharling††† of Copenhagen, leave the subject undecided; while still others, honest seekers after truth, are as yet unable to see their way through all the difficulties that surround these epistles.

It is not proposed in this article to remove these difficulties. To do so would require more time and space than we have at our command. A brief examination of the doctrinal contents of these epistles of the Constitution of the Apostolic Church as presupposed by them, of the allusion to heresy, and of the linguistic peculiarities found in them, is all that is attempted.

I. Let us, then, first, briefly examine the doctrinal contents of the Pastoral Epistles, and see how far, or rather how near, they correspond with the teachings of St. Paul, as laid down in his other writings.

Historical Notices.

A careful and unbiased student of the Pastoral Epistles can scarcely fail to notice that they bear the impress of St. Paul's

* Introduction to the New Testament, (English Translation: T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)

† *Die Aechseit der Pastoralbriefe.*

‡ "Biblical Commentary on the New Testament," (in connection with the work of Olshausen. English Translation: T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)

§ *Die Pastoralbriefe Pauli Erklärt.*

‖ *Erklärung der Pastoralbriefe.*

¶ *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters.*

** In J. P. Lange's "Commentary on the New Testament," (English Translation, edited by Dr. Phil. Schaff.)

†† *Neutestamentliche Isagogik.*

‡‡ *Die Geschichte der Heil Schriften des Neun Testaments.*

§§ In Meyer's *Crit. Exeget. Commentar über das Neue Testament.*

‖‖ "The Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul."

¶¶ "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul."

*** "Commentary on New Testament," vol. iv. (New York: Nelson & Phillips.)

††† "*Die Neuesten Untersuchungen über die Sog. Pastoralbriefe des Neuen Testaments.* (German Translation from the Danish original.)

mind. Not only does his name stand at the beginning of the three epistles, (Παῦλος Ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,) but repeated references are found in the context to the Gospel committed to his trust, (1 Tim. ii, 11; ii, 7; 2 Tim. ii, 8; iv, 17; Titus i, 3; cf. Rom. ii, 16; xvi, 25;) to facts in his life, such as having persecuted the Church, (1 Tim. i, 13;) to his conversion, (1 Tim. i, 13–16;) to his persecutions and afflictions at Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra, (2 Tim. iii, 11;) to his acquaintance with Timothy's family, (2 Tim. i, 5;) to his many fellow-laborers, (Demas, 2 Tim. iv, 10; cf. Col. iv, 14; Philem. 24; Tychicus, 2 Tim. iv, 12; Titus iii, 12; cf. Acts xx, 4; Ephes. vi, 21; Col. iv, 7; Lucas, 2 Tim. iv, 11; cf. Acts xvi, 10; xx, 5; xxi, 18; Col. iv, 14; Philem. 24; Marcus, 2 Tim. iv, 11; cf. Col. iv, 10; Philem. 13; Aquila and Priscilla, 2 Tim. iv, 19; cf. Acts xviii, 2; Rom. xviii, 3; 1 Cor. xviii, 19; Erastus, 2 Tim. iv, 20; cf. Acts xix, 22; Rom. xvi, 23; Trophimus, 2 Tim. iv, 20; cf. Acts xx, 4; xxi, 29; Apollos, Titus iii, 13; cf. Acts xviii, 24; xix, 1; 1 Cor. i, 12; iii, 6–12; xvi, 12;) to the Churches he founded in Ephesus, (2 Tim. i, 17; iv, 12;) in Thessalonica, (2 Tim. iv, 10;) in Galatia, (2 Tim. iv, 10;) in Corinth, (2 Tim. iv, 20;) in Troas, (2 Tim. iv, 13;) and to his imprisonment and defense at Rome, (2 Tim. iv, 6–8, 16, 17.)

Upon this historical background the doctrinal system of the Pastoral Epistles rises to view. True, it does not appear as complete as in the more elaborate epistles of the great apostle; yet a close examination of it will reveal the Pauline method. The starting point is

The Fallen and Depraved Condition of Man.

All men are sinners, and, therefore, stand in need of salvation through the mercy of God, (1 Tim. ii, 4; Titus iii, 5.) They are foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another, (πλανώμενοι, ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, ἐπιθυμίαι καὶ ἡδοναί παντοῖαι, κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγοντες, στυγητοὶ μισοῦντες, ἀλλήλους, (Titus ii, 12; iii, 3.) Nor is this all: they are unto every good work reprobate, (πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι,) and therefore exposed to destruction and perdition,

(ὄλεθρος καὶ ἀπώλεια, Titus i, 16; 1 Tim. vi, 9; cf. 2 Thess. i, 9; ii, 3; Rom. ix, 22.) In this sad condition not only the Gentiles are found, but the Jews as well, (καὶ ἡμεῖς, etc., Titus iii, 3,) who profess to know God, but in their works deny him; (Titus i, 16; cf. Rom. ii, 17–24;) and who, notwithstanding their zeal for the law, (1 Tim. i, 7; cf. Romans x, 2,) are abominable and disobedient, (βδελυκτοὶ καὶ ἀπειθεῖς, Titus i, 16.) Does not this brief delineation of man's sinful state forcibly remind us of the awful picture on the same subject drawn by the same hand in the first and second chapters of the Epistle to the Romans? Is not a similarity of thought and expression perceptible?

Of God's Purpose to Save Man.

But just as sin and death are universal, (1 Tim. v, 6; cf. Rom. v, 12; 1 Cor. xv, 21; Eph. iv, 18,) so, too, are salvation from sin, (σωτηρία,) and eternal life, (ζωή,) which God has provided for man; wherefore he is called Σωτήρ, (1 Tim. i, 1; ii, 3; iv, 10; Titus ii, 10; iii, 4,) a name which, as applied to God the Father, is not found in the other epistles of St. Paul;* but as applied to Jesus Christ, it is found in Acts xiii, 23; Eph. v, 23; Phil. iii, 20; 2 Tim. i, 10; Titus i, 4; ii, 13; iii, 6. According to his own purpose and grace, (κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν, 2 Tim. i, 9; cf. Rom. viii, 28–30; Eph. i, 11; κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἴλεως, Titus iii, 5,) and before the world began, (πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, 2 Tim. i, 9,) God willed that all men should be saved, (πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, 1 Tim. i, 15; ii, 4; ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, Titus ii, 11; ὅς ἐστί σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, 2 Tim. iv, 10,) a purpose that will be realized only in the elect, (ἐκλεκτοι, 2 Tim. ii, 10; Titus i, 1,) or in those called with a holy calling, that is, in the believers, (2 Tim. i, 9; 2 Tim. iv, 10.) This gracious purpose, originally kept secret, (a μυστήριον ἀποκεκρυμμένον, or σεσιγημένον, Rom. xvi, 25; Eph. iii, 9; Col. i, 26,) was made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, (φανερώθεῖσαν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος, etc., 2 Tim. i, 10; Titus ii, 11; iii, 4,) who came into the

* The name Σωτήρ, as applied to God the father, is found, besides in the passages referred to above, in but two other places in the New Testament, namely, in Luke i, 47, and Jude 25. In the Septuagint it is found in Psa. xxiv, 5; Isaiah xii, 2; xlv, 15.

world (*ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, 1 Tim. i, 15) to save sinners, wherefore he is called our Saviour, *σωτήρ*, (2 Tim. i, 10; Titus i, 4; iii, 6.) That he is God, is evident from the expressions, *ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, and *Θεος* * *εφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*, (1 Tim. iii, 16;) and that he is at the same time man, is equally evident from the expression, *ἄνθρωπος Ἰεσοῦς Χριστός*, (1 Tim. ii, 5; cf. Rom. v, 15; 1 Cor. v, 15; Phil. ii, 7.) As the only Mediator between God and man, (*εἷς μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*, 1 Tim. ii, 5; cf. Gal. iii, 19, 20.) sprung from the seed of David, (2 Tim. ii, 8; cf. Rom. i, 3,) he procured our salvation by giving himself for us, (*ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, Titus ii, 14; cf. Rom. viii, 23; Gal. ii, 20; Eph. v, 2, 25;) and, therefore, he, as the *Χριστος ἐσταυρωμενος*, forms the *λόγος* of all gospel-preaching, (1 Cor. i, 17, 18, 23.) And since death is the penalty of man's sin, the object of Christ's death can have been no other than, by voluntarily taking upon himself man's guilt and by voluntarily suffering the penalty in his stead, to abolish death and to bring life and immortality to light, (*καταργήσαντος τὸν θάνατον, φωτίσαντος ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν*, 2 Tim. i, 10.) The believer has already on earth laid hold on eternal life, (1 Tim. vi, 12, 19; Titus ii, 12;) but he will inherit it as the perfect fulfillment of the *σωτηρία* in God's heavenly kingdom. Hence, here he is an heir according to the hope of eternal life, (*κληρονόμος κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου*, Titus iii, 7,) an expression based upon the Pauline view of adoption. The final taking possession of eternal life which will take place in that day, (*ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, 2 Tim. i, 12, 18; iv, 8; cf. 2 Thess. i, 10,) that is, at the appearing of Christ, (*ἐπιφάνεια*, Titus ii, 13; 1 Tim. vi, 14; 2 Tim. iv, 1,) the Judge of the living and the dead, (2 Tim. iv, 1; cf. 1 Thess. iv, 16, 17; 1 Cor. xv, 51; Acts viii, 4,) will be connected with eternal glory, (2 Tim. ii, 10,) and with a share in His reign, (*συμβασιλεύσομεν*, 2 Tim. ii, 12; cf. Rom. v, 17.)

* Even if in this passage the reading *ὅς*, instead of *Θεὸς*, be adopted, as is done by Tischendorf and Tregelles, the deep dogmatic significance of the passage remains unimpaired. For a critical discussion of these readings, *vide* Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Græce*, editio octava Maiora, and Tregelles' edition of the *Greek New Testament, in loc.*; also, Scrivener's "Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.," pp. 15, 440, 455, 550, and 552.

Of Justification.

Now, in so far as Christ has freed us from the guilt of sin and the fear of death, he has paid a ransom for us, (*ἀντίλυτρον*, 1 Tim. ii, 6: *λυτροῦν*.) an expression that reminds us forcibly of Paul's conception of the *ἀπολύτρωσις*, (Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14.) In virtue of this ransom having been paid for us, we may be justified by God's grace, (*δικαιοῦσθαι*, Titus iii, 7;) so that here, too, we meet with the Pauline doctrine of *δικαίωσις* in the forensic sense of the term. (Gal. ii, 16, 17; iii, 8, 11, 24; v, 4; Rom. ii, 13; iii, 20, 24, 26, etc.) But the condition upon which we may obtain *δικαιοσύνη* and *σωτηρία* is not the merit of our good works, (*οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα*, 2 Tim. i, 9; *οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὧν ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς*, Titus iii, 5,) but faith only, (1 Tim. i, 14, 16, 19; ii, 15; iii, 13; iv, 10, etc.;) wherefore Christianity appears in the light of a divine dispensation (unto salvation) which is in faith, (*οἰκονομία** *Θεοῦ ἐν πίστει*, 1 Tim. i, 4.) The reason why the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and not by works, does not occupy as prominent a place in these epistles as in those to the Romans and the Galatians, may be found in the fact that those to whom they were addressed were not so "zealous of the law" as to require the apostle's warning and corrective voice. But here, also, notwithstanding that warning voice is raised against other errors and abuses, the central position of faith in the system of Christian doctrines is maintained with all the strength of a profound conviction.

Of Regeneration.

Justification and regeneration, though taking place at one and the same time, are nevertheless logically separate and distinct. This logical distinction is apparent not only in the other Pauline Epistles, but in the ones under consideration as well. Being justified by God's grace, (Titus iii, 7,) we are saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he shed on us, (*διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου*, Titus iii, 5, 6.) The words *διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγ-*

* Tischendorf, Tregelles, and others, adopt the reading *ροἰκονομία* in preference to *οἰκοδομία* of the Textus Receptus. For a statement of their reasons, *vide* their latest editions of the Greek Testament *in loc.*

γενεσίας have by many commentators been interpreted in an arbitrary manner in that they maintain that λουτρόν, being a figurative expression for baptism, is regeneration itself, or at least the direct cause of it. That this is a forced, and, hence, a wrong interpretation, is evident from the fact that in the Apostolic Church persons were baptized *after* they had made a profession of faith, (Mark xvi, 16; Acts ii, 41,) and after they had received the gift of the Holy Ghost, that is, after they had been regenerated, (Acts ix, 17, 18; x, 44–48.) The whole expression διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, (λουτρόν being derived from the verb λούειν, *to wash, to cleanse*, metaph., to render pure, namely, from sin, that is, to deliver from its consequences, Rev. i, 5,)—the genitive in both expressions being that of the efficient cause—may, therefore, be interpreted thus: As by means of the bath the body is cleansed from impurities, so the soul, through the λουτρόν of regeneration, effected by the Holy Spirit, is saved and cleansed from sin and guilt. Παλιγγενεσία is always accompanied by an outpouring, upon the soul, of the Holy Spirit—a view that is apparent in all the epistles of St. Paul. True, the word παλιγγενεσία is found in no other epistle; yet the great fact, namely, the introduction into the soul of a new life-giving principle, is mentioned by him in other terms, such as, ζωοποιεῖν, ἐγείρειν, (Eph. ii, 5, 6; cf. Rom. vi, 6–10,) καινὴ κτίσις, (2 Cor. v, 17,) ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοὸς, (Rom. xii, 2; 2 Cor. iv, 16; Col. iii, 10.) Having been regenerated by the Holy Spirit, we become thus righteous, (δίκαιος, 1 Tim. i, 9; Titus i, 8; cf. Eph. v, 9,) and the power and grace of God, (2 Tim. i, 8; Titus ii, 11,) as revealed in the inspired Scriptures, (2 Tim. iii, 16,) lead us to live soberly, righteously, and godly, (σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβως, Titus ii, 12,) as it becomes the saints. (1 Tim. v, 10.)

Of Good Works.

It has been urged as an objection against their genuineness that the Pastoral Epistles lay more stress upon good works than the other writings of St. Paul. But its validity cannot be sustained by a comparison of the teachings of the two classes of epistles on this subject. The godly (εὐσεβως) life of the regenerated person, according to the Pastoral Epistles, manifests

itself in good works, (1 Tim. vi, 11, 12, 18; 2 Tim. ii, 21; Titus i, 16; iii, 14.) These the Apostle Paul calls elsewhere the fruits of the Spirit, (Gal. v, 22; Eph. v, 9;) the fruits of righteousness, (Phil. i, 11;) the fruits unto holiness, (Romans v, 22)—the result of faith that *worketh* by love, (Gal. v, 6.) True, while he attaches nowhere a saving merit to them, he every-where insists upon their performance as an evidence of a godly life, especially in our epistles, because of false teachers whose life was any thing but holy. (1 Tim. iv, 2; vi, 4, 5; 2 Tim. ii, 16; iii, 2, 5; Titus i, 11, 16.)

Aside from this, there is nothing in the Pastoral Epistles that is at all strange to the well-known doctrinal conceptions of St. Paul. The requirement that Christians should be prepared for every good work, (*πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον*, 2 Tim. ii, 21; iii, 17; Titus iii, 1; cf. 2 Cor. ix, 8,) yea, be zealous of good works, (*ζηλωτὴς καλῶν ἔργων*, Titus ii, 14,) and that the preacher be a pattern of good works, (*τύπον καλῶν ἔργων*, Titus ii, 7,) is in entire conformity with the apostle's teachings. And when it is said that godliness with contentment is great gain, (*πορισμὸς μέγας*, 1 Tim. vi, 6,) it is by no means intended thereby to deviate from the doctrine of *σωτηρία εκ χάριτος*; for the gain is a promise of a *future* reward as well as of a present one. (1 Tim. iv, 8.)

So, too, there is no contradiction between what is said of woman in 1 Tim. ii, 15, and in 1 Cor. vii. If the former passage declares that she shall obtain *σωτηρία* by fulfilling her specific calling, (*διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας*,) it also specifies immediately thereafter the other indispensable condition of this *σώζεσθαι*, namely, a continuance in faith, and charity, and holiness, with sobriety; a requirement that is in perfect harmony with the teachings of 1 Cor. vii.

On the other hand, it may at first sight appear somewhat strange in the Apostle Paul to declare here that the rich, by being rich in good works, treasure up for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, (*ἀποθησαυρίζοντες ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν θεμέλιον*, 1 Tim. vi, 18, 19,) and that those who have discharged the duties of a deacon well, acquire for themselves a good degree, (*βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιοῦνται*, 1 Tim. iii, 13.)* And yet, rightly interpretated, these passages are no more

* This is not the place to give an extended exegesis of these passages. The reader is referred to Whedon's and Meyer's "Commentaries," *in loc*

opposed to the Pauline doctrine of σωτηρία εκ χάριτος, than Rom. ii, 6–8; 1 Cor. iii, 8; 2 Cor. v, 10; or than Christ's saying in Luke xvi, 9, 11–16, and in Matt. vi, 24.

The Gospel—A Doctrine.

A striking and much-discussed point in the Pastoral Epistles is, that in them the Gospel, or Christianity, is spoken of as a *doctrine* which is of God, (διδασκαλία ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, 1 Tim. iv, 6; vi, 1, 3; Titus ii, 10,) and is preached by his servants, (1 Tim. iv, 13, 16; v, 17; 2 Tim. ii, 2; iii, 10,) who are therefore called κῆρυκες (1 Tim. ii, 7; 2 Tim. i, 11; iv, 17,) and μαρτύριοι and διδάσκαλοι, (2 Tim. i, 11; iv, 2,) and εὐαγγελισται. (2 Tim. iv, 5.) As opposed to the morbid (1 Tim. vi, 4) and irrational (1 Tim. i, 6, 7; iv, 1; 2 Tim. iii, 8, 9; Titus i, 10–14) heterodoxy, (ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 1 Tim. i, 3; vi, 3,) the Gospel of Christ is the sound doctrine, (ἡ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλία, 1 Tim. i, 10; 2 Tim. iv, 3; Titus i, 9; ii, 1,) the godly doctrine, (εὐσέβεια διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim. vi, 3; ὑγιαινόντες λογοι, 2 Tim. i, 13; ὑγιὴς λόγος, Titus ii, 8;) expressions which, in their metaphorical sense, are nowhere else found in the New Testament. The contents of this doctrine are the word of God, (Titus i, 3; ii, 5; 2 Tim. ii, 9,) sometimes called simply the word of truth, or the truth, (2 Tim. ii, 15; iv, 2; iii, 8; ii, 18; iv, 4; Titus i, 14.) Now, if the Gospel be conceived as a doctrine, it is clear that its acceptance implies that it is to be learned, (2 Tim. iii, 14,) and that it thus becomes the knowledge of the truth, (1 Tim. ii, 4; 2 Tim. ii, 25; iii, 7; Titus i, 1,) or the knowledge of God, (Titus i, 16; 2 Tim. iii, 15.) But this knowledge must always be accompanied by faith; for Πίστις and (the knowledge of) Αλήθεια are inseparable. (1 Tim. ii, 7; iv, 6–8.) And faith, in turn, must rest upon a pure conscience, (καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει, 1 Tim. iii, 9; 2 Tim. i, 3; 1 Tim. i, 5, 19.) But where the conscience is pure the faith is also sound, (Titus i, 15; ii, 2;) and where the conscience is seared by sin and hypocrisy, there faith becomes shipwrecked, (1 Tim. i, 19,) or degenerates into vain jangling, (ματαιολογίαν, 1 Tim. i, 6; iv, 7; Titus i, 10.) Thus Christian knowledge and Christian faith and purity of heart are so closely related that, where the latter is destroyed by sin, there the other two must necessarily also suffer injury, (1 Tim. vi, 10,)

Therefore, a holy life is as necessary as sound doctrine, and *vice versa;* that is, the head must be right, as well as the heart.

Now, if the question be asked, Why did the Apostle Paul, in these epistles, set forth the Gospel of Christ in the form of a godly or sound doctrine? it may be replied, that the errors, both in doctrine and in practice, that had crept into the Churches, of which Timothy and Titus had the charge, no doubt led him to do so. He knew that these errors originated with men corrupt in mind and destitute of truth, (*ἄνθρώποι διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦς καὶ ἀπεστερημένοι τῆς ἀληθείας*, 1 Tim. vi, 5; 2 Tim. iii, 8,) given to all kinds of excesses, (1 Tim. iv, 1–3; 2 Tim. iii, 2–4; Titus i, 11, 16,) and hence, lacking godliness, (*ἀσέβεια*, 2 Tim. ii, 16.) Toward such deceivers he could pursue but one course, namely, by pointing out the inseparable union of sound doctrine and sound morals, to insist on the acceptance of the one and the practice of the other, and thus to put a stop to their mischievous agitation.

While we fully admit, in the Pastoral Epistles, a perceptible deviation from the method adopted by St. Paul in the composition of his other epistles, we feel at the same time constrained to maintain that a careful examination of the two classes of epistles will show that both have sprung from the same mind, and that the deviation is due rather to the circumstances that led to their composition, than to a change in the apostle's sentiments or convictions.

II. We come now to briefly consider, in the second place, the *doctrine of the Christian Church and its constitution*, as developed in the Pastoral Epistles.

It has been urged as an objection to their genuineness that they presuppose the constitution of the Apostolic Church to have been in a far more complete style of development than there is any reason for assuming, and that they lay greater stress upon a rigid administration of church discipline than the other Pauline epistles. Now, even if we admit the validity of the objection, which we do not, it must be remembered that these epistles were addressed to comparatively young ministers who, though being overseers (*ἐπισκοποί*) or pastors, had as yet little experience in organizing Churches and administering church discipline. Hence they stood in need of spiritual in-

structions as to the mode of procedure. And who was better qualified to give such instructions than the great apostle, who had founded and organized so many Churches? Again, it is now generally admitted that these epistles were written toward the close of the apostle's life. May it not, therefore, be reasonably inferred that the constitution of the Apostolic Church had at that time passed far beyond the first stage in its development? True, it may not have existed in an elaborated or complex form; but whatever its form may have been, it was, doubtless, based upon a verbal, but sufficiently definite, agreement among the Apostolic College and mother Church at Jerusalem, embodying the principles of church government laid down by Christ himself, as well as the results obtained from experience in organizing and governing individual Churches. But, though there may have been such an agreement, we are by no means justified by the acts or epistles of the apostles in inferring that it was rigid or inflexible in its nature, and hierarchical in its tendency. On the contrary, the whole tenor of the apostolic writings shows that much liberty was taken in respect to introducing such modifications as the time and circumstances might require. Thus, for example, the Churches founded in pagan cities departed without scruple from the Jewish customs and practices. They felt themselves under no constraint to adopt, for the sake of preserving the agreement or constitution intact, the same form of Jewish worship as was observed by the Church at Jerusalem. But these minor differences, arising from the perfect law of liberty, did not prevent the existence of a substantial union, both as to faith and practice. A proof for the existence of such a union may be found in the generous contributions made by the Churches in Asia Minor and Greece to the suffering Churches in Palestine. Thus the constitution of the Apostolic Church—if, in the proper sense of the word, it was a constitution—was neither elaborate and inflexible in its form, granting to but few arbitrary power over the people of God; nor loose and latitudinarian in its application, allowing to each individual Church the fullest liberty of faith and practice; but a *spiritual body*, based upon a common faith, as well as upon the great principles laid down by Christ himself, exercising no constraint but that of Christian love and truth, and granting to each Church

the right, consistent with the common faith, to manage its own affairs. We cannot but believe that a full elaboration of the views here presented and based, as we claim them to be, upon the apostolic writings, would weaken, if not destroy, the force of the objection against the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph.

After these preliminary remarks, let us examine these epistles a little more closely for the purpose of ascertaining more fully what they teach concerning the Church and its constitution. And, first, as to

The Doctrine of the Church.

The Church of the living God (*ἡ ἐκκλησια τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος . . . τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, 1 Tim. iii, 5–15; cf. Acts xx, 28; 1 Cor. i, 1) is founded by and upon God, (*θεμέλιος θεοῦ*, 2 Tim. ii, 19; cf. Eph. ii, 20.) She is also called the pillar and ground of truth, (*στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, 1 Tim. iii, 15,) the house of God, (*οἶκος θεοῦ*, 1 Tim. iii, 15; cf. Heb. iii, 6,) in which he is Lord, (*δησπότης*, 2 Tim. ii, 21,) and the ministers are his stewards, (*οἰκονόμοι θεοῦ*, Titus i, 7; cf. 1 Cor. iv, 1; ix, 17.) She is composed of true Christians, though bad persons and hypocrites are also found within her pale; or, to use the apostle's figure, vessels of honor and vessels of dishonor, (*σκεύη εἰς τιμήν καὶ σκεῦη εἰς ἀτιμίαν*, 2 Tim. ii, 20, 21; cf. 1 Cor. i, 29; v, 1, 2; Matt. vii, 21.) But whether one belongs to the one or the other of these classes does not depend so much upon a "*Decretum absolutum Dei*," as upon one's own volition and conduct, (1 Tim. i, 12, 13; ii, 4;) for all are called with a holy calling, (2 Tim. i, 9; cf. Matt. xii, 16,) to be his own people, (*περιούσιος λαός*, Titus ii, 14; cf. 1 Peter ii, 9,) or to be saints, (Rom. i, 7; 1 Cor. i, 2; 2 Cor. i, 1; Eph. i, 1; Col. i, 2, 4, 12, 24,) in order thereby to constitute the communion of saints, that is, the Christian Church.

The Church spoken of in these epistles is represented as being under the immediate guidance of the apostles, who, through the will of God, (*διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ*, 1 Tim. i, 1; 2 Tim. i, 1; Eph. i, 1; Col. i, 1; 2 Cor. i, 1; 1 Cor. i, 1; Rom. i, 1,) are called, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus, (2 Tim. i, 1,) to be the witnesses of Christ (Acts i, 8) and of his resurrection, (Acts iv, 33,) as well as to

preach the Gospel of God, (Rom. i, 1,) for the purpose of leading men to faith and the knowledge of the truth, (Acts i, 1; cf. 1 Cor. v, 8; Eph. iv, 15.) As their immediate co-laborers are mentioned Timothy and Titus, besides several others, (1 Tim. i, 2, 18; 2 Tim. i, 2; ii, 1; Titus iv, 5,) who are sometimes called the servants and ministers of the Lord, (*δουλοι καὶ διάκονοι κυρίου*, 1 Tim. ii, 24; 2 Tim. ii, 24; cf. 1 Cor. iii, 5; 2 Cor. vi, 4, 11, 23; Eph. vi, 21; Col. i, 7; iv, 7; 1 Thess. iii, 2.) Consecrated to their office by the laying on of the hands of the apostles and the presbytery, (1 Tim. iv, 14; 2 Tim. i, 6; cf. Acts vi, 6; xiii, 3,) they are to guide the Churches under their pastoral care by word and deed, by sound doctrine and good example, (1 Tim. i, 3; 2 Tim. i, 13; Titus i, 5; ii, 1.) For this purpose they are furnished by the apostle with special instructions: 1. In relation to the appointment of elders or bishops, (Titus i, 5;) 2. In relation to the treatment of elders, widows, and young men, (1 Tim. v, 1–22; Titus ii, 2–17;) 3. In relation to family government, (1 Tim. ii, 9–15; v, 14; Titus ii, 3, 4; cf. 1 Cor. xi, 8, 9; xiv, 33–36; 2 Cor. xi, 3;) 4. In relation to the rich, (1 Tim. vi, 17, 18;) and, 5. In relation to servants, (1 Tim. vi, 1; Titus ii, 9, 10; cf. Eph. vi, 5–8; Col. iii, 22–25.)

But it is their special duty to give attention to sound doctrine. (1 Tim. iv, 13–16; 2 Tim. iv, 2, 3; Titus ii, 7.) They are to preach the word in season and out of season, (2 Tim. iv, 2,) and in the same spirit in which they received it. (2 Tim. iii, 10, 11.) Then they are to select faithful men, and, having instructed them in the doctrines of Christianity, ordain them elders, to the end that they may be thus prepared to teach others also,* (2 Tim. ii, 2; Titus i, 5,) and thus propagate the Gospel from one generation to another. The apostle regards aptitude to teach, that is, to preach, as a special qualification of an elder, (*διδακτικόν*, 1 Tim. iii, 3,) on which account such a one is worthy of double honor. (1 Tim. v, 17.) We are not,

* Here we have an indication of the necessity of giving a theological training to those who are called to preach the Gospel. The apostle, knowing that seducers or later teachers of false doctrines would creep into the Church, (1 Tim. iv, 1–6,) urges the importance and the necessity of such a measure. Hence, he earnestly exhorts Timothy and Titus to constantly study the Scriptures, (2 Tim. ii, 15; iii, 14–17,) so that they might become (1) approved unto God, and (2) able workmen that need not be ashamed, *rightly* dividing the word of truth.

however, warranted to infer from this (as De Wette and Baur did) that the apostle made here a sharp distinction between πρεσβύτεροι προεστῶτες and πρεσβύτεροι κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ. He was merely solicitous that, on account of heretical teachers, the pastors of individual Churches should be mighty in word and deed, and so be able to refute them. So, too, the detailed instructions as to the selection of proper persons for the various offices in the individual Churches owe their origin, no doubt, to the apostle's anticipation that sooner or later his personal superintendence over them would cease, and that they would thus be left to depend upon their own resources for their further growth and development.

Of the Officers of the Church.

Apart from the apostolic office, which was *sui generis*, the Pastoral Epistles mention *four* classes of officers in the Church, namely: 1. *Elders* or *bishops*, (πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι,* 1 Tim. iii, 1–6; v, 1, 17; Titus i, 5, 7;) 2. *Evangelists*, (εὐαγγελισταὶ, 2 Tim. iv, 5; cf. Acts xxi, 8; Eph. iv, 11;) 3. *Deacons*, (διάκονοι, 1 Tim. iii, 8, 12; iv, 6;) and, 4. *Church-widows*, (χῆραι, 1 Tim. v, 3–16.)

* There have been long and repeated controversies respecting the official meaning of the terms πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος, as found in the apostolic writings of the New Testament. Without wishing to re-open the controversy on this subject, we take the liberty to state some of the points which we regard as definitely settled:—

1. There is no authority in the New Testament for assuming that there is a difference, *as to orders*, between a πρεσβύτερος and an ἐπίσκοπος. 2. There is no authority in the New Testament for assuming that there was, in the Apostolic Church, a generic difference, *even as to the office*, between a πρεσβύτερος and an ἐπίσκοπος. 3. There is no indication in the New Testament that the πρεσβύτεροι or ἐπίσκοποι of the Apostolic Church displayed a *hierarchical* tendency, or that any one among them assumed the precedence before the others. 4. The New Testament clearly indicates that πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος were employed in the Apostolic Church as *synonymous* terms, both describing the *same order* as well as the *same office*, (Phil. i, 1; 1 Tim. iii; Titus i, 5–7; Acts xx, 28; 1 Pet. ii, 25; v, 1–5; the one having reference to the *age* required for, and the honor connected with, the office, and the other to its *duties*. 5. Nor can it be proved from the New Testament that the apostles appointed successors in the apostolic office, having the same authority and distinction as themselves. That office was *sui generis*, and was not to be perpetuated. Hence, for prelates of any Church to claim that they are co-ordinate in rank and authority with the apostles, is both preposterous and anti-scriptural.

The episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church corresponds more nearly with the episcopacy of the Apostolic Church than that of any other (modern) Church.

Elders or Bishops.

Elders or bishops, as well as evangelists and deacons, appear to have been constituted in the same manner. The ceremony of consecrating and inducting them into their respective offices consisted in fasting and prayer, and the imposition of hands either by the apostles alone, (2 Tim. i, 6; Acts vi, 6; xiv, 23,) or by the apostles *and* the presbytery, (1 Tim. iv, 14; 1 Pet. v, 1–5;) the apostles were also counted among the elders;) or by some invested by the apostles with the authority to do so. (Titus i, 5.)

The character and qualifications for their sacred office required of the elders or bishops are more clearly indicated than their duties. They must be blameless; the husband of one wife, (*μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα*;) vigilant; sober; peaceable; given to hospitality; not greedy of filthy lucre, (*αἰσχροκερδῆ*;) not covetous, (*ἀφιλάργυρον*;) not given to wine, (*μὴ πάροινον*;) must rule their own households well; having well reported children; be no novices, (*νεόφυτοι*;) must have a good report of them which are without; and be apt to teach, (*διδακτικόι*;) so that they may be able by some doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.*

* The peculiarity of the enumeration here given of the qualifications required of an elder or bishop has been urged by some critics as an objection against the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles. That a candidate for such an office in the Church should possess such a character and such qualifications as are here specified, is so self-evident, it is urged, as to need no such enumeration. But when the fact is taken into consideration that improprieties, and even immoralities, had crept into the Apostolic Churches, (1 Cor. v, 1, 2; vi, 1–8; viii, 12; 2 Cor. ii, 7–13; xi, 1; xii, 20, 21; Gal. iii, 1–3; v, 17; Tit. i, 10–16,) to say nothing of what was prophesied would happen in this respect, (1 Tim. vi, 1–3; 2 Tim. 1–9, it is entirely in conformity with St. Paul's wisdom and forethought that he should instruct his sons in the Gospel, young and comparatively inexperienced as they were, that in the selection of men for the office of elders or bishops particular regard should be had as well to their *moral standing* in the Churches in which they were to labor, as to their *zealous adherence* to and *thorough knowledge of the Gospel doctrines*. Soundness in morals was then, as is now, as necessary to a successful spread of the Gospel as soundness in doctrine.

With respect to the exact meaning of the words *μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνδρα*, opinions vary. But the *grammatical* sense, whatever else may be supposed to be implied in the expression, is certainly the correct one, namely, that a *πρεσβύτερος* or *ἐπίσκοπος should be married*, and be married to no more than *one* wife at the same time. The injunction is, therefore, directed: (1.) Against those who forbid marriage

Their duties appear to have been twofold: 1. The celebration and conduct of divine worship, consisting in public and private prayers, (Acts vi, 4;) the ministry of the Word, (Acts vi, 4,) that is, preaching the Gospel and refuting the gainsayers, (Titus i, 9,) thus feeding and instructing the Church, (Acts xx, 28; 1 Pet. v, 2;) perfecting the saints, edifying the body (Church) of Christ, and improving the work of the ministry, (Eph. iv, 11, 12;) in the administration of the sacraments, (Matt. xxviii, 29; Acts ii, 41, 42; 1 Cor. i, 14; xi, 23;) and the visitation of the sick, (James v, 14.) 2. Church government, or the administration of the discipline, that is, the discharge of episcopal functions; they were placed by the Holy Ghost *among*, not *over*, the flock as overseers, (*προσέχετε . . . παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ,*) *ἐν ᾧ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους*, Acts xx, 28; 1 Pet. v, 1–5; Titus i, 5–7.)

Evangelists.

In connection with elders, or bishops, the Pastoral Epistles mention also *evangelists*, (*εὐαγγελισται*, 2 Tim. iv, 5; cf. Acts xxi, 8; Eph. iv, 11,) who were either colaborers with the apostles, or, in a more general sense, teachers of Christianity. Though they were, no doubt, ordained elders—for the apostle exhorts Timothy, who was an elder, "to do the work of an

to the ordained clergy, (1 Tim. iv, 3;) and, (2.) Against polygamy and, no doubt, against concubinage. Both these practices prevailed still, to some extent at least, during the apostle's life-time, (see Josephus, Antiquities, xvii, I, 13. 1; xviii, I, 5. 1; Apostol. Const., viii, 32; Kitto's Bible Cyclopædia, Art., Marriage; Smith's Dict. of Chr. Antiq., Art., Concubinage; Lex. Jul. et Pap. Pop.; cf. Just. Mart., Dialog. c. Tryph.;) and might easily have been adopted by some Gentile Christians, especially in Crete, whose inhabitants seem to have been worse than people elsewhere, (Titus i, 12.) That the expression is intended to forbid a second marriage in a presbyter or bishop after the death of the first wife, seems an arbitrary inference. The simple requirement is that at the time of his appointment he must be the husband of one wife, though, as far as any indication to the contrary is concerned, she may be his second wife after the death of the first. Neither Christ nor St. Paul forbid a second marriage in the ordinary sense. (See Matt. xxii, 23–33; John iv, 16–20; Rom. v, 1–8; 1 Cor. vii, 7–39.) The legitimate inference from these passages seems to be that the moral and legal *status* of the surviving party is the same it was before the first marriage, and hence he or she is at liberty to contract a new marriage. And since marriage is a divine, and hence a holy, institution, the remark that abstinence from a second marriage indicates a purer or holier life, and greater devotedness to the work of God, than it otherwise would be, is as inapplicable to a second as to a first marriage.

evangelist"—they were not stationary, that is, were not permanent pastors of individual Churches, but, under the direction of the apostles, went from place to place to preach the Gospel, either by narrating the Gospel history where it was still unknown, thus preparing the way for the direct labors of the apostles, or, where Churches had been organized, by explaining more fully the doctrines of Christianity, until pastors and elders could be appointed from among themselves, thus supplementing or continuing the labor of the apostles. They were *itinerant* preachers in the truest sense of the word. The term *evangelist* was applied to the authors of the four gospels at a much later period, and appears to signify rather the historians of the gospel than its preachers.

Deacons.

The Pastoral Epistles recognize the existence of the office of deacons, but say nothing respecting its origin. The same may be said of the Epistle to the Philippians, (i, 1.) That it was instituted, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, by the apostles, with the consent of the mother Church at Jerusalem, (Acts vi, 1–6,) and afterward introduced into the Churches founded by the apostles and their colaborers, is, with some exceptions, generally assumed, and probably true. That it was subordinate to that of elders, or bishops, and constituted the lowest official grade, may be inferred from Acts vi, 1–6, Phil i, 1, and 1 Tim. iii, 13. In reference to the *duties* of deacons, we have no definite information in the apostolic writings, unless the duties prescribed for "*The Seven*" (Acts vi, 1–6) be regarded as such. So much may, however, be inferred that the deacons were primarily appointed for the purpose of dispensing the charity of the Church and managing its temporal affairs, of seeking out and visiting the sick and afflicted, and of practicing hospitality especially toward persecuted Christians. In short, their duties appear to have been comprehended in the *διακονία τῶν τραπεζῶν*, as distinguished from the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου*. Still, though *διδακτικὸς* was a qualification not required of them, they doubtless taught in private, or were readers of the Scriptures in public assemblies, and occasionally exhorted and preached, for from among them evangelists appear to have been chosen. (Acts vi, 9, 10; vii, 1–53; viii.

5–8, 26–40.*) The possession on their part of special *χαρισμάτα πνεύματικα* would naturally lead, in the course of time, to a higher work and office, as was the case with Philip. Or what else than ecclesiastical preferment did the apostle mean when he wrote: that those who use "the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, (*καλὸς βαθμὸς*,) and great boldness in the faith," (*καὶ πολλὴν παῤῥησίαν ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, that is, great boldness in standing forth for the truth and against error, 1 Tim. iii, 13.) And why did he require in them substantially the same *moral qualifications* as in elders or bishops, if he had not in view their advancement to that office, whose incumbents were not to be *νεόφυτοι*, (1 Tim. iii, 6,) either in piety, or experience, or knowledge, lest they become puffed up with stupid pride? And why did he enjoin upon them "to hold the *mystery of the faith* in a *pure conscience*," if not with a view to their ultimately preaching the Gospel as their regular vocation?

Church-Widows—Deaconesses.

A fourth class of ecclesiastical officers mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles—and in them only by name—are the *Church-widows*, (*χῆραι*, 1 Tim. v, 2–16.) These, together with the *πρεσβύτιδες*, (Titus ii, 3,) and the *πρεσβυτέραι*, (1 Tim. v, 2,) and *ἡ διάκονος*, (Rom. xvi, 1,) were probably placed by the Apostle Paul in the same category. From the qualifications required of them it may be inferred that they constituted a class of female officers in the Apostolic Church who appear to have performed duties in reference to their own sex analogous to those performed by the deacons among men. Their office in the Church was probably rendered necessary by the strict seclusion observed by the female sex in oriental countries. Though it may not have been *exactly* the office of deaconess, as it appeared in a more developed and comprehensive form in the post-Apostolic Church, yet it was no doubt the beginning of it. This

* The Philip mentioned in Acts viii, 5–8, 26–40, as "going down to the city of Samaria and *preaching* Christ unto them," *et seq.*, is not the Apostle Philip, as some have erroneously assumed, but the Philip mentioned in chapter vi, 5, who was originally appointed, with six others, for the *διακονία τῶν τραπεζῶν* in the Church at Jerusalem. From this humble service he was promoted to the office of an evangelist, in which he became successful.

appears evident from two things: (1) from the required enrollment, there must have been a purpose in this other than merely to obtain a list of widows worthy of charity, (*χήρα καταλέγεσθω*, 1 Tim. v, 9;) (2) from the qualifications required of those who were to be enrolled, (1 Tim. v, 9, 10; Titus ii, 3–5.) Besides, Church-history bears us out in supposing that such an institution had already been long in existence at the close of the second century, and that it was universally traced back to the apostolic arrangement as described in these epistles.*

With respect to the qualifications the apostle required of the candidates for this office, it may be observed that here, as elsewhere, he displayed great wisdom and forethought. The candidates were to be chosen from among widows (*χῆραι*) over sixty years of age, having been the wife of one husband, well reported for good works, *et seq.* A good age insured, generally, experience, wisdom, stability of character, and steadiness of purpose. Having been the wife of one husband—whatever this may mean—enabled her to teach the younger women domestic virtues, (Titus ii, 3–5,) and to exert a salutary influence over them; and having followed good works, secured for her a public recognition of being a trustworthy and godly person.

Now, if nothing more than ordinary membership, and that of a class needing charity, was had in view, it would be difficult to understand all the qualifications here required of them. On the other hand, it is in perfect harmony with the spirit of Paul's teachings and practice to establish a holy relation between the humblest member and the Church. He desired the services of all for the upbuilding and strengthening of the Church. Hence the widow was far better adapted for the office of deaconess than the unmarried woman, for she had experience of human life; she knew its great sorrows, and her position gave her a special fitness for administering consolation. The fact that the rule, as to age, was, in the post-Apostolic Church, so far modified as to permit *virgins* to be appointed to that office,† is a

* *Vide Tertull. de Vel. Virg., c. q.; Clem. Alex., Strom.* iii; *Constit. Apost.*, iii, 15, 16; ii, 26; *Epiphan., Expos. Fid.*, c. xxi; Neander's "History of the Planting," etc., sub., *Deac.;* Schaff's "History of the Apostolic Church," sub., *Deac.;* Guericke's "Handbuch der Kirchen-Geschichte," pp. 107, 108; Herzog's "Real. Encyclopæd.," sub., *Diakonissa.*

† *Vide Tertull., de Vel. Virg., c. q.*

strong proof against the post-apostolic origin of the Pastoral Epistles, as maintained by Dr. Baur.*

We flatter ourself that the preceding observations will lead intelligent and unbiased minds to acknowledge that the conception of the Church and its constitution, as unfolded in the Pastoral Epistles, bears the stamp of St. Paul's mind, and is in perfect harmony with his other writings. Nowhere in his epistles do we find traces of an *hierarchical* establishment, but only the broad outlines and essential features of a church constitution. According to him, the Christian Church is realized or embodied in the particular Churches. These, in his time, he formed into separate organizations, but on the same substantial basis. They were united among themselves, but the bond of union was a purely spiritual one; it was never a chain. Neither did he nor they appeal in any matter to the authority of the Church as a whole. At the time he wrote these epistles there were no general and periodical assemblies for the purpose of deciding questions that might be referred to them. The so-called council at Jerusalem did not issue any thing like positive decrees; it confined itself simply to recommending a compromise.† Hence, the objection that the Pastoral Epistles presuppose the existence of a well-designed church constitution, such as we find in the second and third centuries, falls to the ground. The objectors put something into these epistles which is not found there and does not belong there.

III. We come now to consider briefly a *third* peculiarity of the Pastoral Epistles, namely, *the heresy alluded to, or warned against therein.*

Dr. Baur maintains that the heresy therein refuted belongs to the Gnosticism of the second century. Hence, he argues, these epistles cannot have been written by the Apostle Paul, but by a pseudo-Paul who lived during that century. This criticism, supported as it is by a great show of learning, has called forth voluminous discussions on both sides of the question. It would carry us far beyond the scope of this article were we to attempt to give a history of these discussions. We shall simply indicate the main results obtained.

* *Vide* Baur's "Paulus," Part II, chap. ix.

† *Vide* Pressensé's "Early Years of Christianity," book ii, chap. v.

That the author of these epistles had in view certain heretics (*αἱρετικοὶ ἄνθρωποι*, Titus iii, 10) by whom the Christians were in danger of being led astray, and that many of his statements were directed against them, cannot be called in question. But it is by no means clearly made out that their erroneous doctrines belonged to the Gnosticism of the second century, that is, that they were *borrowed* from the Gnostics of that century. Far from containing a complete description of the tenets of the latter, the Pastoral Epistles give us only the general features, entirely unconnected among themselves, of a heresy, the nascent elements of which, according to Dr. Baur's own showing in his work on the Christian Gnosis, (pp. 34–40,) were already in existence among the Jews before the time of Christ. To find more than this in these epistles is to find something which in reality is not there. It may, perhaps, be proper to give here, in a somewhat connected form, the delineation, as found in the Pastoral Epistles, of the character of the heretics mentioned therein, in order that the reader may judge for himself whether it has been proved beyond successful contradiction that their tenets are none other than those of the Gnostics of the second century, with which history acquaints us.

In the *first* epistle Timothy is warned against those who have turned away from a pure heart, a good conscience, and unfeigned faith, (*ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου*, 1, 5, 6,) and concerning faith have made shipwreck, (*περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐνανάγησαν*, i, 19;) and who, being destitute of the truth, (*ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας*, vi, 5,) and not holding to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus Christ, (*ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, vi, 3,) are morally corrupt, (*διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν*, vi, 5,) proud, and boast of the possession of special knowledge, (*τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*, vi, 20,) which they desire to communicate in the form of certain doctrines, (*ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*, i, 3.) But their doctrines being mainly doctrines of devils, (*διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων*, iv, 1,) consist only in vain jangling (*ματαιολογία*, i, 6) and profane and vain babblings (*βεβήλοι κενοφωνίαι*, vi, 20) about old wives' fables (*βεβήλοι καὶ γραώδεις μῦθοι*, i, 4; iv, 7) and endless genealogies, (*γενεαλογίαι ἀπέραντοι*, i, 4,) causing questions and strifes of words, for which they have a vicious fondness, (*νοσῶν περὶ*

ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, vi, 4.) They desire to be teachers of the law without understanding its real meaning, (*θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, i, 7,) proposing arbitrary commandments which prohibit marriage and the use of meats which God has created, (. . . *κωλυόντες γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων*, iv, 3.) By their seemingly ascetic life they seek to gain the reputation of being very pious, making godliness the means of obtaining worldly gain, (*νομιζοντες, πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*, vi, 5,) having at the same time their conscience seared as with a hot iron, (*κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν*, iv, 2.)

In the *Second* Epistle to Timothy the heretics are described, as in the First Epistle, as being persons who, having fallen from the faith and turned away from the truth, (*περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν*, ii, 18; *ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν*, iii, 8; *οἱ ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι*, ii, 25,) and being morally corrupt, (*ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν*, iii, 8; *πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι*, iii, 13,) are in the snare of the devil, (*τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος*, ii, 26.) They have the form of godliness, but by their being *φιλάργυροι, ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι, ἄστοργοι, ἄσπονδοι, διάβολοι, ἀκρατεῖς, ἀνήμεροι, ἀφιλάγαθοι*, etc., (iii, 1–7,) they deny the power thereof, and hence will not endure sound doctrine, (iv, 3.) They secretly endeavor to propagate their tenets, consisting in profane and vain babblings and foolish and unlearned questions, (ii, 16, 23,) by creeping into houses, insinuating themselves into the good graces of silly women laden with sins, and, by perverting the truth, leading them into still greater sins, (iii, 6–8.) Among such classes of persons their word—namely, the perversion of the truth, such as the declaration that the resurrection is past already—eats as doth a canker, (ii, 17, 18,) and thereby undermines their faith.

In the Epistle to Titus the heretics, or gainsayers, (*ἀντιλέγονται*, i, 9,) are represented as belonging mostly to the Jews, (*μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, i, 10.) While pretending to possess a special knowledge of God, they lead a godless and abominable life, (*βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς*, i, 16,) and thus defile their conscience and being condemned by it, (i, 15; iii, 11.) What they teach consists in Jewish fables, (*Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις*, i, 14,) genealogies, and foolish questions about the law, (*μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καί ἔρεις καὶ μάχας νομικὰς*, iii, 9,) and mere com-

mandments of men that turn the hearers from the truth, (ἐντοκαὶ ανθρώποι ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, i, 14.) They are vain talkers, (ματαιολόγοι, i, 10,) teaching what is unseemly, (διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ, i, 11,) and as deceivers, (φρεναπάται, i, 11,) causing schisms in the Church, (αἱρετικὸι ἄνθρωποι, iii, 10,) and all this for filthy lucre's sake, (αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν, i, 11.)

From the preceding delineation it is evident that the author of the Pastoral Epistles had, in the main, one and the same heresy in view. The attempt to resolve it into *four*,* or at least *three*,† distinct classes, is now regarded as a total failure, and is, therefore, to be dismissed without further consideration. Nor are we left in the dark as to the nature and tendency of this heresy. True, the views on this point vary widely, and yet it is not so difficult, as it may at first sight appear, to gather from the mass of conflicting opinions a tolerably correct idea of its character. Its predominant element is that of an ascetic Judaism. It is not, however, of the same type as the Judaism which the apostle opposes in other of his writings, the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians for instance. It was, no doubt, a kind of Essene-Judaism, ascetic in its tendency, that had "become enamored of and wedded to Oriental mysticism."‡ Ephesus, and, indeed, most provinces of Proconsular Asia, had become centers of religious and speculative thought. Would it not, therefore, be strange, if the kind of Judaism referred to had entirely escaped these influences? Indeed, there can be no question about the fact that this Oriental theosophic mysticism had a large share in producing the false doctrines (ἑτεροδιδάσκαλιαι, 1 Tim. i, 3; vi, 3) denounced in the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle to the Colossians. It appears that false teachers, (ἑτεροδιδασκαλοι,) mostly from among the Jews, (μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, Titus i, 10,) infected with this strange medley of Essene-Judaism and pagan notions, had succeeded in creeping into the Christian Churches at Ephesus, Colosse, and Crete, and, by boasting of a φιλοσοφία, which the apostle stigmatizes as a κενὴ ἀπατη, (Col. ii, 8,) and a γνῶσις ψευδωνύμος, (1 Tim. vi, 20,) in undermining the faith of some

* Credner: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.*

† Thiersch: *Versuch zur Herstellung*, etc., pp. 236, 273.

‡ Professor Lightfoot: "St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon," p. 95, etc., where this subject is fully discussed.

members in the simple truth of the Gospel, and thereby causing them concerning the faith to make shipwreck. That these false teachers were mostly Jews, is evident, first, from the expression, *μάλιστα οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*, (Titus i, 10;) and, second, from the fact that they desired to be teachers of the law, (*θέλοντες εἶναι νομοδιδάσκαλοι*, 1 Tim. i, 7,) pretending to have derived their doctrines from Jewish *tradition*, (*παράδοσιν*, Col. ii, 8, that is, *Ἰουδαϊκοὶ μῦθοι*, Titus i, 14,) as well as from the (recorded) *genealogies*, (*γενεαλογίαι*, 1 Tim. i, 4,) the spiritual significance or allegorical interpretation of which were spun out *endlessly*, thus making them virtually *ἀπεράντοι*,* (1 Tim. i, 4.) Is it to be wondered at that this indulging in subtle inquiries concerning the *γενεαλόγιαι* and *Ἰουδαϊκοὶ μῦθοι* should provoke discussions that had the characteristics of *βεβήλοι κενοφωνίαι καὶ γραώδεις μῦθοι*, of which St. Paul warns Timothy? Nor should it be overlooked that these speculations—*ἑτεροδιδάσκαμαι*—frequently led to practical extremes: either to rigid asceticism, forbidding marriage and the use of meats which God hath created, (1 Tim. iv, 3,) or to unbridled license, putting away a good conscience, (1 Tim. i, 19,) and loving pleasure more than God. (2 Tim. iii, 3.) The predominance of one or the other of these extremes was, no doubt, owing to the predominance of

* "This is the meaning we attach to the words *γενεαλογίαι ἀπεράντοι*. Some have supposed the reference to be to the *genealogies of the eons* in the system of emanations; but this would infer a system of Gnosticism much more advanced than that here described, (if it be a system at all.) Mangold shows that the word *genealogy* has never been taken in this sense in the Gnostic systems. He quotes, after Dæhne, a passage from Philo, which justifies the interpretation we have given. Philo, in fact, after dividing the Pentateuch into two parts—the first comprising the laws and ordinances, the second the historical documents—makes under the latter head two further subdivisions, the historical, properly so called, and the *genealogical* portion: *Ἐστὶν οὖν τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ, τὸ μὲν περὶ τῆς τοῦ κοσμου γενέσεως, τὸ δὲ γενεαλογικον· τοῦ δὲ γενεαλογικοῦ, τὸ μέν περὶ κολάσεως ἀσεβῶν, τὸ δὲ αὖ περὶ τιμῆς δικαίων*—'Of the genealogies one portion refers to the punishment of the wicked, the other to the rewards of the righteous.' (*Philo, De Vita Contemplativa, a. o. θ.* § 4.) Thus, the genealogies, according to him, were to show the punishment of the wicked and the recompense of the just. It is evident that they can do this only under an allegorical system of interpretation. Now, it is known that Philo found in the genealogies a complete psychology. The names represented to him the conditions of the soul, (*τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς.*) It is easy to imagine what important results the party of Judaizing heretics might derive from the innumerable genealogies of the Old Testament."—*Pressensé:* "The Early Years of Christianity," pp. 287, 288.)

one or the other of the speculative elements in the hybrid union of Essene-Judaism and Oriental theosophic mysticism.

Now, if this union of Essene-Judaism and Oriental theosophic mysticism was Gnostic in its character—and we readily admit that it was—there is no evidence whatever that it points to a period posterior to that of the apostles, that is, that it is the Gnosticism of the second century. Indeed, it has been fully proved by Professor Lightfoot, in his "Dissertation on the Colossian Heresy," that Gnosticism was not necessarily an offspring of Christianity, but a direction of religious speculation which existed independently of it, and that it in its leading features had already established itself in the apostolic age, especially in those parts of Asia Minor (Ephesus and Crete) with which our epistles are concerned. If this be true, there can be no doubt that Christianity, coming into contact with it, would naturally arouse it to unwonted activity by leading men to dwell more earnestly on various philosophico-theological questions; and thus, after no long time, this Gnosticism would absorb into its system more or fewer Christian elements, or Christianity in some of its forms would receive a tinge from Gnosticism.

The conclusion to which our brief inquiry has brought us is this: The Pastoral Epistles combat a heresy composed of speculative and ethical elements both of Essene-Judaism and of Oriental theosophic mysticism, from which it received a Gnostic tinge; a heresy which existed already in the apostolic age, not, indeed, in a completely developed system, but only in its incipient stages. When, therefore, such theologians as De Wette, Neander, Rothe, Matthies, Bleek, Wiesinger, Baumgarten, Böttger, Guericke, Van Oosterzee, Conybeare and Howson, Huther, Lightfoot, Whedon, and others, have not only not been convinced of the justness of Dr. Baur's conclusion, supported as it is by the most comprehensive learning, that the Pastoral Epistles deal with the Gnosticism of the second century, but point more or less to this, that the "germ of Judaizing Gnosticism, or a Judaizing theosophic-ascetical tendency, such as shows itself in the two Epistles to Timothy, (and in that to Titus,) must *à priori* be presupposed as existing at that period, (that is, in the apostolic age) as the heresies of the second century point back to such a tendency evolving itself out

of Judaism," (Neander)—it may well be assumed that his (Baur's) theory is no longer tenable, and that consequently the apostolic authorship of the pastoral epistles is triumphantly vindicated.

IV. We turn now to a brief consideration of the *linguistic peculiarities* of the Pastoral Epistles. An argument against their genuineness has been drawn from what is alleged to be peculiar and un-Pauline in them, especially with respect to the new words and phrases with which they abound. De Wette's criticism is particularly full on this point.* But to say that a large number of new words and phrases occur therein, is only to affirm what is true in reference to every one of St. Paul's Epistles. A brief comparison will prove this. Thus, the number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα are: In 1 Timothy, *eighty-one*, (of which the following are examples: διώκτης, i, 13; ὑπερεπλεόναζω, i, 14; ἀποδοχή, i, 15; iv, 9; ἐνανάγεω, i, 19; ἐντεύξεις, ii, 1; iv, 5; ἥρεμος, ii, 2; ἀπόδεκτος, ii, 3; ἀντίλυτρον, ii, 6; κόσμιος, ii, 9; iii, 2; θεοσέβεια, ii, 10; τεκνογονία, ii, 15; v, 10; διλόγος, iii, 8; βαθμός, iii, 13; ὁμολογουμένως, iii, 16; ψευδολόγος, iv, 2; μετάληψις, iv, 3; ἐπιπλήσσω, v, 1; ἀμοιβή, v, 4; καταλέγω, v, 9; καταστρηνιάω, v, 11; φλύαρος, v, 13; περίεργος, v, 13; οἰκοδεσποτέω, v, 14; προκρίμα, v, 21; πρόσκλισις, v, 21; ὑπόνοια, vi, 4; ἀδηλότης, vi, 17, etc.;) in 2 Timothy, *sixty-three*, (such as: ἀναζωπυρέω, i, 6; ἀναψύχω, i, 16; δίδωμι ἔλεος, i, 16; εὑρισκω ἔλεος, i, 18; πραγματεία, ii, 4; στρατολογέω, ii, 4; αθλέω, ii, 5; χρήσιμος, ii, 14; ἀνεπαίσχυντος, ii, 15; ὀρθοτομέω, ii, 15; νεωτερικὰς, ii, 22; ἀνεξίκακος, ii, 24; ἀντιδιατίθεμα, ii, 25; ἀνανήφω, ii, 26; φίλουτος, iii, 2; ἀνήμερος, iii, 3; φιλήδονος, iii, 4; φιλόθεος, iii, 4; ἔκδηλος, iii, 9; ἀγωγῇ, iii, 10; γόης, iii, 13; θεόπνευστος, iii, 16; ἐπισωρεύω, iv, 3; κνήθω, iv, 3, etc.;) and in Titus, *forty-four*, (such as: ἀψευδὴς, i, 2; ὀργίλος, i, 7; ἐγκρατής, i, 8; φρεναπάτης, i, 10; βδελυκτός, i, 16; ἱεροπρεπής, ii, 3; φιλάνδρος, ii, 4; φιλοτέκνος, ii, 4; ἀκατάγνωστος, ii, 8; κοσμικὰς, ii, 12; περιούσιος, ii, 14; φιλανθρωπία, iii, 4; φροντίζω, iii, 8; αἱρετικὸς, iii, 10, etc. In the Epistle to the Galatians there are more than *fifty-seven*; in that to the Philippians, *fifty-four*; and in those to the Ephesians and Colossians, together about *one hundred and forty*. While, then, the existence of such ἅπαξ λεγό-

* See De Wette's *Lehrbuch der Historisch-Kritischen Einleitung in die Kanonischen Schriften des Neuen Testamente*, fifth edit., pp. 307–313.

μενα in the Pastoral Epistles is fully admitted, we are by no means justified in drawing therefrom an argument of the least evidencial value against their Pauline origin; otherwise, by the same process, the genuineness of every one of St. Paul's epistles might be impugned. If, then, we find in his epistles addressed to Churches an abundant supply of new words not before used by him, how much more natural is this in the Pastoral Epistles, addressed as they are to individuals, colaborers with and under him!

May we not expect, *à priori*, that in these epistles a new class of words will appear, when we find this in every one even of the epistles that are otherwise homogeneous? Of still greater importance, however, is another circumstance to be noticed here. These epistles, as the criticism to which we are opposed is wont most to insist upon, bring before us, in detail, forms of the religious life altogether new, and errors the like of which do not occur in the other epistles. These new things, if they are to be called by their names, must, of necessity, give rise to new designations. And if now these epistles treat of the institutions of the Church, and contain directions to Titus and Timothy for the right management of the affairs of the Church, topics which we find handled in none of the other epistles, how could it be otherwise, than that new expressions should occur in connection with these subjects? Besides, if these epistles collectively belong to a later period (in St. Paul's life) than all the rest, and pretty nearly to the same period, what ground is there, *à priori*, for surprise at finding that they are closely related to each other, and differ considerably from the rest, especially as they all refer to matters which till then were unknown? There is, then, no reason for our being perplexed by the occurrence of new expressions and formulas! *

Again, the very peculiarity found in the construction of sentences and periods indicate the mind of the Apostle Paul in all its versatility and fertility of resources. While in his other epistles the sentences are often involved and obscure, the thoughts in their fullness and profundity struggling, as it were, for adequate expressions, the style of the Pastoral Epistles is mostly smooth and flowing, seldom, if ever, losing itself in long periods and participial constructions, or showing *apostrophèses* or abruptly broken-off sentences. In this respect these epistles belong to the most lucid and easily understood writings of the New Testament. They contain few such serious gram-

* Wiesinger's "Commentary to St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Titus, and 1 Timothy," General Introduction, p. 329. (Edinburgh translation.)

matical and rhetorical difficulties as are found, for example, in the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians. And yet this difference is explainable by the difference of the subject-matter discussed in the two classes of epistles. For it is of the utmost importance to the form in which thoughts are clothed, whether the subject-matter under discussion relate to the councils and revelations of God, or to personal and ecclesiastical affairs. Thus, a close study of the Pastoral Epistles will reveal the fact that whenever the apostle discusses dogmatic questions, his language shows a leaning toward long and involved sentences. (Comp. 1 Tim. i, 8–11; vi, 13–16; 2 Tim. i, 8–12; Titus ii, 11–14; iii, 3–7.)

There is, therefore, no warrant whatever for the conclusion that the linguistic peculiarities of the pastoral epistles form an evidence against their Pauline origin; the less so, since a comparison with them of similar expression, taken from some of his other epistles, will show, in the main, an agreement in thought such as might be expected from a mind of such wonderful fertility and originality as that of the Apostle Paul. To illustrate this remark, let us compare the following expressions:—

1 Tim. ii, 11, 12.

Γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ· γυναικὶ δὲ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.

1 Cor. xiv, 34.

Αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται* αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεσθαι.

1 Tim. ii, 13.

Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὔα.

1 Cor. xi, 8, 9.

Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικός, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ ἐξ ἀνδρός· καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα.

2 Tim. i, 3, 4.

Χάριν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ . . . ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω τὴν περὶ σοῦ μνείαν ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσί μου νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἐπιποθῶν σε ἰδεῖν.

Rom. i, 8, 11.

. . . εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου . . . ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι, πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος . . . ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς.

2 Tim. ii, 5.

Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλῇ τις, οὐ στεφανοῦται, ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ.

1 Cor. ix, 24.

Οὐκ οἴδατε, ὅτι οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἷς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ βραβεῖον.

2 Tim. ii, 6.

Τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον τῶν καρπῶν μεταλαμβάνειν.

1 Cor. ix, 7.

Τίς φυτεύει ἀμπελῶνα καὶ τὸν καρπὸν οὐκ ἐσθίει.

* This is the form of the word in Tischendorf's *Editio Octavo Critica Major* of the Greek New Testament, whereas in the *Textus Receptus* the word reads ἐπιτέτραπται.

2 Tim. ii, 11.	Rom. vi, 8.
Εἰ γὰρ συναπεθάνομεν, καὶ συζήσομεν.	Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ πιστεύομεν, ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ.
2 Tim. ii, 20.	Rom. ix, 21.
Ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ . . . ἐστι σκεύη . . . ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμήν, ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν.	Ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν.
2 Tim. iii, 2–4.	Rom. i, 29–31.
. . φίλαυτοι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλάζονες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀστοργοι, ἀσπονδοι, διάβολοι . . . τετυφωμένοι.	. . . πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πονηρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ, κακίᾳ . . . ψίθυριστάς, καταλάλους . . . ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους . . . γονεῦσιν, ἀπειθεῖς, ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀνελεήμονας.

Compare also 1 Tim. i, 12–14 with 1 Cor. xv, 9, 10; 2 Tim. ii, 8 with Rom. i, 3; 2 Tim. iv, 6 with Phil. ii, 17; Titus i, 1–4 with Rom. i, 1–6, etc.

Now, the similarity of language and thought in the preceding quotations is certainly not the result of the plagiarism of a pseudo-Paul, but rather of the association of ideas. A pseudo-Paul, desiring to palm off his literary productions as genuine Pauline writings, would have spread his colors more glaringly. He would, no doubt, have copied the linguistic peculiarities of the other Pauline epistles, and striven to give his productions a Pauline character, thus making a sad botch of his work. But the Pastoral Epistles show no traces of plagiarism or of a patchwork. They bear the impress of Paul's mind, and the deviation of their style from that of his other epistles is explainable by the essential difference of the situations in which he wrote the two classes of epistles. Nor is it at all surprising that he should have used in them, occasionally, similar thoughts and expressions. Where is the orator or author that in a long and laborious life does not occasionally repeat himself? Hence the similarity in thought and expression in the above compared quotations, far from impugning the genuineness of the pastoral epistles, is really an evidence in favor of their Pauline origin.

Again: we meet in these epistles formations and combinations of words found in his other epistles. Thus, the combination of the preposition *ὑπερ* with verbs and other words to intensify their meaning, is of frequent occurrence in all his epistles. Take, for example, the following: *ὑπερεπλεόναζειν*, 1 Tim. i, 14; *ὑπεραυξάνειν*, 2 Thess. i, 3; *ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ*, Eph. iii, 20; *ὑπερ-*

λίαν, 2 Cor. xi, 5; ὑπερεπερισσευσεν, Rom. v, 20. So, too, we meet with the same or similar words and phrases; as for example: εὐαγγέλιον . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ, 1 Tim. i, 11; Titus i, 3; Gal. ii, 7; 1 Thess. ii, 4: πιστόν με ἡγήσατο, 1 Tim. i, 12;=ἠλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι, 1 Cor. vii, 25; καλὸς ὁ νόμος, 1 Tim. i, 8;=ὁ νόμος ἅγιος, Rom. vii, 12; δυνατὸς ὁ θεὸς, 2 Tim. i, 12; Rom. xi, 23; and many more.

We bring our brief investigation to a close. It is possible that a more critical scholar may consider some of the reasons adduced in favor of the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles unable to stand his test, but it seems that every unprejudiced reader must acknowledge that the problem of their genuineness finds an easier and more natural solution in the way we have briefly indicated, than in that pursued by the negative critics. We have omitted to discuss the question concerning the *time when* and the *place where* they were written, for the reason that it belongs to their *external* history rather than to their *internal* peculiarities. The reader will find full discussions of it in Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," and in Wiesinger's, Huther's, Van Oosterzee's, and Whedon's Commentaries on these epistles.

In conclusion, we may be allowed to state that the *external* testimonies in favor of their genuineness possess almost a cumulative force. In this respect they belong to the most favored of St. Paul's epistles. Though they have been subjected to the severest tests and to the keenest scrutiny, they have come forth triumphantly, and "made the prejudiced confess their truth and feel their power." They "now live, and so brightly and forever shine."

Art. V.—SCHOPENHAUER AND HIS PESSIMISM.

There are three ways of looking at this lower world of ours: the optimist view, the pessimist view, and the Christian view. The first and the second contain, each, one half of the truth; the third rejects the two false halves and embraces the two true halves of the first and second, and hence contains the whole truth. The optimist view basks in the sunshine, and refuses to see the shadow. The pessimist view broods over the gloom,

and shuts its eyes to the cheer. These two views prevail more or less wherever there is an absence of essential Christianity; but they do not always appear in pure forms. Though the utter opposites of each other, they are often strangely mingled together in the same age, in the same system, in the same heart. And even in the same heart the one often successively conqueror is conquered by the other, according as the pulse of the life beats high or low. This is true, also, of all Christians in so far as not yet totally recovered from sin: outward prosperity exalts us into optimism; adversity thrusts us down into pessimism. Optimism is akin to youth, health, spring-time, love, plenty; pessimism is related to want, envy, winter, indigestion, and unstrung nerves. Hence optimism predominates in the heroic and youthful periods of man and of nations, while as yet the tide of vigor and success runs at full channel; while pessimism comes to the surface when passion has quenched the fire of the heart, and prosperity has matured its harvest of vice and misery.

The truth of optimism lies in the fact that there actually is in our post-Adamic world, despite its infection with sin, a large share of sunshine, of happiness, of good. The truth of pessimism lies in the equally undeniable fact that our world, as it now is, is sadly full of blight and suffering, tears and disappointment. The sole way out of these two one-sided half-truths, is to synthetize the half-truths into the whole truth: and this truth is Christ's truth. Thus we have the equation: *Optimism—its falsity+pessimism—its falsity=Christianism.* Christianism, in fact, looks at the world in the whole of its truth, namely, as a very good world, though fearfully baddened by sin. It is the only system of philosophy that can squarely and fairly grapple with the whole problem of life. Optimism and pessimism are about equally remote from Christianism: though, for the individual soul, the pessimist state is the more hopeful of the two, inasmuch as blank despair is nearer to the kingdom of God than presumptuous hope.

As all human movements of thought and of life tend to branch off toward the opposite errors of optimism and pessimism, so has it been also with modern German speculation. The current of thought sent forth by Kant has tended largely toward optimism. Fichte, Hegel, and partly also Schelling,

were essentially optimistic. Their systems claimed to have attained to absolute truth, and to the solution of all mysteries. They exalted man into a demi-god, and painted the future of society in the brightest of colors. They were eminently systems of hopefulness. During the first quarter of this century they filled the whole philosophic firmament with the attractive brilliance of their delusive glare. No pessimist taper stood the least chance of getting the public attention. But there were pessimist fires smoldering here and there in secret. The high-sounding "absolute truth" of Fichte and Hegel was seen by some to be resultless and unsatisfactory. None saw it more clearly, and, we may say, more impatiently and scornfully, than Arthur Schopenhauer. But Schopenhauer's scorn could not make itself heard; his dismal philosophy made no impression upon the enthusiastic throng of hopeful "absolutists." And so he was left to brood out and brood over his system for weary decades of years in almost absolute solitariness. At length, however, he did get a hearing: the fire and clamor of the absolutists died away; the new generation saw into the emptiness of the lofty pretensions; and a reaction began to set in. Discovering that man is after all not a god, they were now, many of them, ready to be convinced that he is—*nothing*. As the system of Schopenhauer finally attained to wide vogue, and as it has at the present hour large favor among certain classes in European society, it may not be unworthy of passing attention. Especially will it be instructive to observe how closely all forms of error are related to each other—how readily the transition *may* be made from the very highest results of modern secular culture to the bottomless night of Oriental paganism. But as Schopenhauer's system was intimately intertwined with the current of his life, we shall first glance briefly at his personal history.

To this end abundant materials are at hand. The best in German are by Gwinner, (*Arthur Schopenhauer*, etc., Leipzig, 1862;) by Lindner, (*Von Ihm, über Ihn*, Berlin, 1863;) by Frauenstädt, (*Memorabilien*, *Briefe*, etc.) French writers also have given some attention to Schopenhauer. T. Ribot's little work (*La Philosophie de Schopenhauer*, Paris, 1874,) presents as adequate a picture of the author and his system as can well be obtained apart from a study of his works

themselves. But English writers have given him little attention. In this article we have made most use of Ribot.

Schopenhauer's life covered the years from 1788 to 1860. His father was an opulent merchant of Dantzig, and later of Hamburg; hence his early opportunities were very abundant. His mother was a gay and gifted writer of fiction. His youth was passed in an atmosphere of art. At the age of nine he was taken abroad, to Switzerland, France, and England. After a year's stay in Paris he spent six months in London. This gave him a thorough hatred of what he called English bigotry, and made him long for a descent, upon that benighted island, of a good sprinkle of apostles of "reason" and missionaries of "free thought." On his return to Hamburg he engaged in commerce, but soon turned from this in disgust, and gave himself to miscellaneous reading. At this period his father became unfortunate in business, and took refuge in suicide. His mother soon after removed to the gay literary circle of Weimar, and sent her son to the gymnasium of Gotha. Of any healthy moral influence of either her or her husband upon the son we find little trace. From the suicide of the father the son seems to have received decidedly dark views of life. Henceforth his course was that of a sardonic, skeptical inquirer after the truth. How far he fell short of finding it will appear as we examine his progress.

After studying Kant and Plato at Göttingen, he came to Berlin, in 1811, to hear Fichte. "But his *à priori* admiration for Fichte soon gave place to contempt and raillery." Two years later he prepared a thesis on the nature of the sufficient reason,* received his doctorate, and, coming to Weimar, became interested in Göthe. Here, also, he fell in with a learned orientalist, F. Majer, and thereby attained an insight into the pantheistic lore of the Indians—a turning-point in his life. From 1814 to 1818 he lived at Dresden, studying art, frequenting society of no too moral sort, and developing his strange system of philosophy. The result was the masterpiece of his life: "The World as Will and Representation," (*Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, Leipzig, 1819.) This work contains the entire system of the author, his later writings contributing simply further developments of special points. The work, as far as the public was concerned, seemed to be an utter failure.

* Vom Zureichenden Grunde, 1813.

For twenty years it failed to awaken the least ripple of interest, or even of contempt.

After making a brief sojourn in Italy, enjoying art and indulging in the pleasures which his theory of life so thoroughly condemned, he returned to Berlin, and lectured one *semester* in the university as *privat-docent.* But the popularity of Hegel and Schleiermacher eclipsed and offended him. From this point dates his hatred of university teaching and of "official professors of philosophy." After another stay in Italy, and then another attempt at teaching, he came to Frankfurt in 1831, where he spent in solitude and study the last twenty-nine years of his life.

As yet he was utterly unknown to the general public. His solitude now only served to render his spleen against the "philosophic charlatans and Calibans," to whom he attributed his failure of success, all the more acrid and spiteful. In 1836 he published a small work "On Will in Nature," (*Ueber den Willen in der Natur*, Frankfurt.) In this essay, which also fell still-born from the press, he passed in review all the physical sciences, endeavoring to show the *rôle* which (that which he called) "will" plays in the phenomena of nature. Toward its close he waxes indignant against the philosophy of the universities, and styles it "that bastard imitation of scholasticism which regards the catechism of the priests as the highest criterion of truth."

It was only in 1839 that a little accident thrust him on the public attention. A society of Norway having offered a prize for an essay on "Liberty," Schopenhauer wrote one, gained the prize, and was elected to membership in the society. The following year he wrote, for a prize offered by a Danish society, on the "Basis of Morality," but was unsuccessful. These two essays he afterward published, entitling them "The Two Ground-problems of Ethics," (*Die Beiden Grundprobleme der Ethik.*)

The first essay was surely but a small success, and yet from it dates the incipiency of his fame. He was now read, praised, assailed. His chief work was re-edited and re-issued. He now counted a few devoted disciples. The system of Hegel was waning, from day to day. Its "left" wing came to contempt in the platitudes of Feuerbach and Max Stirner, and in

the demagogy of 1848. Schopenhauer profited by this, applauding the political reaction, and managing to thrust his philosophy into the vacuum left by the school which had collapsed. The political convulsion of 1848–49 having passed, he published his last work, two volumes of miscellanies, under the title of *Parerga und Paralipomena*, Berlin, 1851. He now rose rapidly to fame. The "Westminster Review," of April, 1853, introduced him to the English public. His disciple, Frauenstädt, published a complete exposition of his doctrines. Finally, the University of Leipzig offered a prize for an elaborate criticism of his philosophy. Thus he at last obtained a good measure of that fame for which he had so long and so impatiently waited. But he did not long enjoy his laurels. His careful temperateness, which he thought would carry him to a hundred years, disappointed him; he was stricken down by a pulmonary apoplexy at the age of seventy-two.

His brain is said to have been one of the largest known—considerably larger than that of Kant, Talleyrand, or Napoleon. Whether such an extraordinary brain was needed to construct such a system as his, is a point on which friends and foes may differ. But what is this system? Schopenhauer assumed to take up philosophy where Kant left it—not Kant in his second and third editions, but Kant in his first and pure edition of 1781, "before he had made concessions to the dogmatism of theology." Thus he takes the negative results of the *Critique* without allowing them to be complemented by Kant's positive position in the "Practical Reason." "My philosophy," says he, "asks not *whence* came the world nor *whither* it tends, nor *why* it is, but simply *what* it is." He pretends to a great horror of vague high-sounding terms, such as "the absolute," "the infinite," "the suprasensible," affirming with Julian the Apostate that they are mere negations. His great discovery, "his hundred-gated Thebes," is, to have reduced every thing to "will." But after reducing the world and every thing to will, he hastens to add, that as to what "will" is *per se* he knows positively nothing, declaring that philosophy has no means of searching for either the efficient cause or the final purpose of the world."

Schopenhauer's system stands therefore intermediate between Kant and Kant's enemies, Hegel and Schelling. Kant says,

"I know *nothing;*" Hegel and Schelling, "I know *every thing;*" while Schopenhauer says, "I know *something.*" But what? All that is contained in experience. "The subject-matter of all philosophy," says he, "must be simply our empirical consciousness in its twofold form of consciousness of self and consciousness of other things." The totality of data furnished in this twofold experience is, as it were, a hieroglyphic, and the duty of philosophy is to decipher it. When all the features of a hieroglyphic are so interpreted as to give a good rounded sense, we say the translation is correct. So with the enigma of the world: philosophy must shed an equal light over all phenomena; the heterogeneous must be reduced to harmony; and opposites must be reconciled: that is all. But if philosophy has only to do with the concrete data of external and internal experience, how then does it differ from physics? Only in this: physics remains entirely within the phenomenal world, dealing with facts as ultimate realities in their distinctive isolation; while philosophy asks after that which lies under and back of these facts—without, however, considering it apart from the facts, and without our attempting to comprehend what this invisible something is *per se.*

Schopenhauer utterly rejects the common distinction between spirit and matter. The world, strictly speaking, is not divisible into thought and extension, as Descartes held, but rather into world real and world *ideal.* The real world is the *ding an sich,* [thing in itself,] the "absolute being," of Kant, which eludes our knowledge. The ideal world is the illusory phenomenal world of sensation and thought. This real world, as we soon shall see, is "will;" while the ideal world is representation or knowledge, in a word, the concrete world of actuality —as generally understood.

After these generalities, we desire now to look at Schopenhauer's views in more detail—as presented in his chief work, *Die Welt,* etc. This work consists of four parts: a criticism of the mind's powers, a theory of nature, a theory of art, a theory of morals. In examining the intelligence Schopenhauer discourses thus:—

The world is my representation, (or objectified thought.) This truth is valid for all sentient beings, though man alone has full consciousness of it. So soon as he begins to think he per-

ceives that he knows neither the sun nor the earth, but that he merely has an eye that *sees* the sun and a hand that *touches* the earth; in a word, that the world about him exists only as a representation, and only in relation to something else, to wit, the perceiving subject. No truth is less in need of proof than this: every object of knowledge, the entire world, is an object only in relation to a subject. The world is my representation! This surely is no very new thought. The *cogito, ergo sum* of Descartes lies in the same direction. It places the starting-point of philosophy in the subjective, in consciousness; for this alone is immediate; every thing else is mediate. Berkeley advanced farther upon the same route—to idealism proper—recognizing that the world of matter about us has no existence independently of the perceiving subject. And, long before Berkeley or Descartes, the philosophy of Vyasa, in India, taught the same truth, namely: that to exist and to be perceived are simply convertible terms.

The dependence of the object upon the perceiving subject constitutes the identity of the world *as representation.* My body itself, in so far as perceived to be extended or active, is but a cerebral phenomenon, and exists only as an intuition of the brain. And yet Schopenhauer pretends not to deny the reality of the world in the vulgar sense of the word:—

> True idealism is not empirical but transcendental. It leaves intact the empirical reality of the world; but it claims that every object is conditioned by the subject in two respects: 1, materially, or as object in general; since an objective thing is thinkable only as in contrast to some subject of which it is the representation; 2, formally; since the mode of the object's existence, that is, the mode of its representation, (under the categories of time, space, and causality,) comes from the subject.

Schopenhauer has tested his literary talent in illustrating the ideality of the world in many fanciful ways. A single example, as cited by Frauenstädt:—

> Two objects stood before me, two objects regular in form and beautiful to be seen: the one a jasper vase ornamented with gold, the other an organized body, a man. After admiring their exterior for a while I begged my attendant fairy to let me look inside of them. She permitted me to do so. In the vase I found only a little of weight, and a certain obscure mutual tendency among its atoms which I have heard called cohesion and affinity. But when I entered the other object, how was I surprised, and how shall I describe what I saw? It was wonderful beyond the highest stretch of fable or fairy tale. In the bosom of this object, or, rather, in its upper part, known as the head, and which when seen

from without looks like almost any other material object, (having form, weight, etc.,) I found—what? The world itself, together with the immensity of space in which the *All* is contained, and the immensity of time in which the *All* acts, and with all the wonderful variety of objects which fill space and time, and (what is almost absurd to say) I discovered there also myself, coming and going, and making this examination. For I discovered all this in that round object hardly larger than a large fruit, and which the naughty executioner can make fall off at a single stroke—at the same stroke plunging also into night the marvelous world which it contains. And this world would in fact exist no longer were it not that this sort of objects do incessantly spring up like mushrooms to receive the world and to keep it from falling back to night, and to sustain among themselves, like a balloon, this grand mirage, which is identical in all brains, and is designated by all under the general name of *object*.

The conclusion to which Schopenhauer's idealism leads him is this: "Matter is, so to speak, a true falsehood." It is an object not of intuition but of thought; it is consequently a pure abstraction. Plotinus and Bruno were right, therefore, in the paradoxical notion that matter is incorporeal. Our astonishment at the varied spectacle of nature is comparable to that of the savage who, on first looking into a mirror, failed to recognize himself. Thus do also we whenever we regard the world as external to ourselves. The fact is, external nature has its source in the intelligence—is born with it, endures with it, dies with it. "The great error of philosophers has been their failure to see that matter and intelligence are correlatives, that is, that the one exists but for the other, that they both rise and fall at the same time, that the one simply reflects the other, that in fact they are but one and the same thing viewed from different phases." And this *thing*, as we shall soon see, is the mysterious something which Schopenhauer calls "*will*."

To the objector Schopenhauer asks: "Does not sleep, dreamless sleep, clearly prove that the world exists only for wakeful heads?" But it is answered: May not the world exist in time and space even if there were no head in the universe to think it? The image in a mirror would, of course, not exist if there were no mirror; but does it therefore follow that if all mirrors were broken, then all objects that are now reflected by them would also disappear? Schopenhauer insists that the ideality of time and space solves this difficulty. Here he follows Kant,

but with a difference. Kant admits two subjective forms of the sensibility—time and space; also twelve regulative concepts of the understanding. Schopenhauer reduces these twelve to the single one of causality, thus admitting but three fundamental forms of knowledge: time, space, and causality. Time and space, now, being the receptacle within which, and the stage upon which, all causality unfolds itself, hence if time and space (the platform) are merely ideal, then the world of causation is so likewise. To prove the ideality of time and space, that is, that they are not objective entities, was no very difficult task; he had only to restate the arguments of Kant. But to infer therefrom that therefore all that takes place *in* time and space, namely: all events, all the workings of causality, in a word, all the phenomena of the universe—is also destitute of objective reality, is simply a very plausible *non sequitur*. The consecutiveness of a man's growth in character, for example, is not, therefore, devoid of objective reality, because the standard which enables us to measure it and compare it with other consecutive realities is only ideal.

But what is the nature of this causality, this something which evolves and spreads out, upon the void framework of time and space, the grand panorama of the phenomenal universe? Schopenhauer's system regards causality, matter, action, as synonymous terms: "Matter is from beginning to end simply causality. Its essence is to act; no other function is conceivable. It is as acting that matter fills time and space." Time and space are *per se* mutually exclusive; but causality conciliates them. It harmonizes the unstable flux of time with the immutable persistence of space: "The subjective correlative of matter or causality is the understanding, the sole function of which is to investigate causality. And, conversely, all causality, all matter, all phenomena, are but *for* the understanding, *by* the understanding, *in* the understanding."

Such is Schopenhauer's notion of the understanding and its objects. To reason he gives very little prominence: it is simply the faculty of generalization. It has nothing of the mystical about it; it has no moral intuitions—no deep eye looking off toward an imaginary infinite.

We are now ready to pass from Schopenhauer's first to his second part, from intelligence to "will"—in a word, from the

nomena to the *ding an sich*, the mysterious reality that underlies them. But how to make the transition? To dissert upon method would here be idle, unless we should apply it at the same time. "It would be like first playing a waltz in order to dance it afterward." The true method and the object of its search are but one and the same thing. We shall find it, therefore, not through means, but directly, immediately. Nor shall we find it by examining things from without; this would give us only images, shadows, not substance. The true method is, therefore, an interior one. The searcher must enter within himself. Doing this, the first object he meets is his body. This body he finds actively concerned in all his experiences. How to explain this intimate connection? One sole idea, one sole conception, will account for it all: that conception is *will*:—

> This word alone gives him the key to himself as object, as phenomenon; it alone reveals to him the inner spring of his being, his acts, his movements. To the thinking subject his body is *given* to him in two different ways: first, as a representation, an object among other objects; second, in an *immediate* manner. In this latter case we come to the will. Every act of will is also an action of the body. The effect of real volition is actual movement of the body. The act of the will and the action of the body are not two states objectively different, and united by the bond of causality; they are not related as cause and effect; they are simply one and the same thing, but given in totally different modes—immediately, and through intellectual intuition. The action of the body is simply the will's act objectified. . . . In conclusion, the essence of our being is *will;* its immediate manifestation is the *body.*

Thus, according to Schopenhauer, the sole, direct, immediate knowledge that we have, is the knowledge of "will." This is the *datum* that is to serve as key to all the rest—the sole narrow gate to the temple of truth. "Hence, we ought to interpret nature by ourselves, and not ourselves by nature." This will is not multiple, but single; it is identical in all beings and being. It is the *ding an sich*, the substance of all things. It is independent; for the world depends on my representation, which depends on my body; and my body depends on "will," which itself depends on nothing.

Here we hardly need to observe that Schopenhauer takes *will* in a very different from its ordinary sense. To him *will*

is self-conscious, not essentially, but only incidentally—in its higher (human) form. It includes the totality of power exerted or at play in the entire universe, such as chemical affinities, vegetative life, animal instinct, volition in man. It is, therefore, nearly equivalent to *force.* But why does he not, then, use this latter word? Because, says he, all causality or force is at bottom the same; but as we know will-force directly, and all other force only indirectly, hence it is more appropriate to designate the species by the highest variety, (especially when that is known immediately,) than by a lower variety, (which is known only mediately.)

The will being, according to Schopenhauer, the very heart of our being, it must be esteemed highest among the elements of our nature. The intelligence, though usually placed first, is really only third in order. Thus, the first place belongs to the will; the second, to the organism, the objectification of the will; the third, to intelligence, which is a function of the organism. "The will is metaphysical; the intelligence, physical; the intelligence is the phenomena, the will is the thing *per se;* more metaphorically, the will is the substance of man, the intelligence is an accident; the will is the matter, the intelligence is the form." This will become evident by the following considerations: By introspection we see that the most fundamental fact in us is the will and its affections: to strive, to desire, to fear, to hope. Also among animals we observe the same thing; the essence of their nature is *desire.* This fact lies at the basis of animal self-preservation and procreation. And as we descend the scale of animal life we observe that intelligence decreases much more rapidly than will. The feeblest and dullest insect wills what it wills as thoroughly as man does. The intelligence grows weary, the will does not. The intelligence is intermittent: in sleep all knowledge ceases; but our inner, metaphysical principle ceases not. In a word, the brain rests, but the organic functions go on forever. This sharp contrasting of will and intelligence is held by Bichat in about the same way as by Schopenhauer, save that Bichat designates as organic life that which Schopenhauer styles as will.

After claiming for will the chief place in man's nature, Schopenhauer now examines its three characteristics: identity,

indestructibility, liberty. *Will*, let us remember, is, according to Schopenhauer, the inner essence or substance of all existence. It prevails in the inorganic and the vegetable kingdoms no less really than in animal life. In these fields it exists in the three stages of causality—cause proper, excitation, motive. In the mechanical world it follows the law of Newton: the action and reaction are equal. In the vegetable world, the action and the reaction are not equal. In animal life proper, that is, in man, the cause need not be equal to the effect, and need not, as in vegetable life, be in contact with the subject. But how do these three things, affinity in matter, life in vegetation, and volition in man, appear to be but three forms of the same underlying *ding an sich*, or will? The answer is that they have the same general traits. When we see the *tendency* of water downward, the *perseverance* of the magnet toward the north, the *effort* of the two electric poles toward each other, the *choice* of elements in forming compounds, it needs no great effort of the imagination to discover that, back of these facts, lurks the same thing which, at higher stages, constitutes vitality in plants and volition in man. The difference lies in the "degree of objectification of the will." In mere matter this degree is at the lowest. In plants it is higher. The plant *prefers* one condition to another: one *tends* to the light, another to the water. In animal life the objectification is at its highest. At this complicated stage of development we come to the realm of motive. Here intelligence becomes a necessity. Here will produces an organ of intelligence, (a ganglion or a brain.) "But with this organism springs up at once *the world as representation* with all its forms, subject and object, time, space, causation, plurality. The world has now two faces; thus far it was mere volition; now it is also representation, or object of the thinking subject. Will has passed from darkness to light." Thus Schopenhauer finds in an assumed identity of volition (force) in all the realms of nature, the unity after which all philosophic thought inevitably strives.

The second trait he attributes to will is indestructibility. As thing *per se*, will is superior to time, and hence to change and to destruction. It exists as an ever-present, somewhat under the form of eternity—"a concept which, having no intuition as its basis, is of purely negative value." All death is

mere appearance, delusion. "Death is really the inspiring muse of philosophy; but for death, people would never have philosophized." The animal is afraid of death, though it has no distinct consciousness of it—each individual enjoying in itself the perennity of the species—existing as if it had no end. With man it is otherwise; hence all philosophies, all religions, have tried to refute or rock to sleep his fears of death. The consolations have vibrated between these two extremes—to consider death as an absolute annihilation, or to admit an immortality of some crude flesh-and-bones sort. Both positions are equally false.

The fact is, the fear of death is independent of conscious knowledge. Every animate being is born with it. The source of this fear is in the "will" which *tends to live.* We are influenced, our whole lives, by two illusions: the love of pleasure, and the fear of death. This is the work of blind "will," using these illusions to reach its end. If man were pure intelligence, death would be indifferent, or even desired. But individual existence is based on will, the tendency of which toward existence and manifestation constitutes the world. And this blind tendency toward life is as inseparable from will as shadow from body. If our fear of death were rational and not simply instinctive, we should naturally be as much disturbed at the infinite non-existence which preceded us as at that which threatens to follow us. But this is not so: we tremble at an infinity *a parte post* without our existence, but not at one *a parte ante.*

But we may learn also from simple observation that nothing perishes. When the swinging pendulum ceases to oscillate, has its weight therefore ceased? Gravitation, electricity, all the forces of nature, assume different forms, but they do not perish. And if the lower forms of nature perish not, how can we suppose that the higher do? True, the phenomena cease. Every thing seems to pass away, but that is mere illusion—an illusion of the intelligence which springs up with the world of phenomena and sinks also away with it. The reality in man is not the individual, but the race. The individual is but the race under the phenomenal forms of time, space, and causality; hence as phenomenon he passes away. "To the race death is simply that which sleep is to the individual." "When we

glance at the future, and think of the millions of generations to come, we are tempted to wonder whence those generations will come, where they are now, out of what womb of naught they can spring up? But where, indeed, *can* they be, if not there where all reality now is, ever has been, and ever shall be? And then, foolish questioner, thou art like the silly little leaf which weeps at the thought of fading in the autumn, and will not be consoled with the prospect of the fresh new leaves that are sure to clothe the tree in the spring. Foolish leaf! recognize, then, thy true being in the inner but ever-active *force* of the tree which, passing from season to season, from tree to tree, remains ever the same, without birth and without death. And man, is he not simply as that leaf?" And here Schopenhauer urges, as confirmation, the celebrated line of Homer: "As the generations of leaves, so are the generations of man." "Look only at your favorite dog, as he lies calmly stretched out before you. Millions of dogs had to die before this one could be born. But the death of these millions has not affected the race. That is why this dog looks so active, so lively. He is as vital as if he had lived forever and were to remain forever. That which died was not the dog, but only his shadow, his image as conceived by us under the forms of time and space." As with this dog, so also with man. "My phenomenal personality is but as trifling a part of my *me*, as my *me* is a trifling part of the universe. . . . Why be concerned at the loss of this individuality, when my inner being has within itself the possibility of individuals without number? . . . A finite individuality, condemned to live without end, would have such a monotonous life that non-existence would be preferable by far. To desire personal immortality would be simply to desire an illusion perpetuated to eternity!" The sole thing indestructible in us, as in any thing else, is really our inner essence, the *ding an sich*—force—"will."

The third trait of "will," according to Schopenhauer, is liberty. But it is a strange kind of liberty. The will is at once both free and necessitated—absolutely free as thing in itself, absolutely necessitated as personal phenomenon. Hence we have the parallel threefold antithesis: in the inner world of being—identity, indestructibility, liberty: in the world of phenomenon—endless variety, birth and death, fate and deter-

minism. The full drift of this practical fatalism we shall consider under the head of morality.

The will, as we have seen, is, with Schopenhauer, the ultimate fact of the world, the underlying essence of all being. What does he mean by will?

> If I am asked this last question: What is this will which manifests itself in the world and through the world—what is it absolutely and in itself? I reply: No answer to this question is possible; seeing that to be known and to be *per se* are contradictory, since whatever is known is, by that very fact, merely phenomenal. . . . In fine, the universal and fundamental essence of all phenomena we have designated as *will*, for the reason that will is its highest manifestation; but by this word we mean nothing other than simply an unknown *x;* and yet we regard this *x* as being, at least in one respect, infinitely more known and more sure than any thing else.

After discussing the intelligence and the will, Schopenhauer comes to the third division of his great work—art. This is the most valuable part of the whole. And the many fine observations here made, together with the beauty of the style, have contributed largely to disseminate the author's speculative views among classes who otherwise would have had little interest in them. But on this subject we shall bestow but little attention, as it is not very essentially involved in the author's general system. Its chief speculative significance lies in the fact that in art, according to the author, the artist may partially withdraw from the outer world of mere appearance, and, contemplating the world of ideals, forget a part of the misery that universally clings to this our entire phenomenal existence.

In the last part of his system Schopenhauer treats of ethics. This is the most eccentric and astonishing feature of the system. Here we behold a highly cultured man of this Christian nineteenth century turning away from the light that blazes in upon all, and going for instruction to the dismal mazes of Buddhistic pantheism. And all this under pretext of consequential philosophizing! But how does he make the transition to this result. In the first place he rejects the notion that ethics, as a discipline, is to have any practical effect on one's life.

> Virtue can no more be taught or learned than genius. . . . Here as elsewhere, the philosopher has only one thing to do—to take concrete facts as he finds them, and then interpret and explain

them. . . . Hence, it will not be expected that this work will contain either precepts, or a general theory of duties, or even any general moral principle from which all the virtues spring. We shall speak neither of unconditional duty nor of a law of liberty, for both of them involve contradictions. We shall not speak of duty at all: such things are well enough for children, and for nations in their infancy, but not for those who possess the culture appropriate for those of mature age.

How, now, is such a position theoretically justified?

Will, or vital force, which is *per se* only a blind and unconscious desire to live, after manifesting itself in the inorganic, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms, attains, in the human brain, to clear self-consciousness. Here, then, occurs a miracle. Man perceives that the world of reality is a delusion, and life a burden; and that the best thing the will can do is to deny itself; for thus would fall at a single blow both all effort and the suffering that is inseparable from it. From one of two courses there is absolutely no escape; *either* the will, taking as a solid reality the delusory world about it, must now desire with full consciousness that which it hitherto desired with blind instinct, and thus cling to life with new energy, (which is to affirm and approve the desire to live;) *or*, the will, after being disenchanted by a knowledge of the vanity of the world, must cease to volitionate, and find, in all the phenomena which tempt it to act, only and simply reasons for non-acting, so as thus to arrive at perfect liberty through perfect repose, (which would be the negation of the desire to live.)

Thus Schopenhauer takes us at a single leap from the cold metaphysics of Kant to the mystic dreamings of the Orient. His ethics is but a repetition of the pantheistic spirit of the sages of India. The following quotation contains its substance almost entire:—

It is simply by the effect of the deceptive forms of *maya* (delusion) that the intelligent principle appears clothed in such varied forms; but contemplation is the sword by which wise men strike asunder the bond of action which enthralls the consciousness.

This antithesis between the affirmation and the negation of the desire to live, is the central spring of Schopenhauer's ethics. It is by it that he judges and classifies all human action. At the bottom of the scale is the egoistic, ardent affirmation of the desire to live. This is the source of all wickedness, hatred, vice. Here the individual is both dupe and duped. Taking the world for a solid reality and himself for a durable entity, the egoist sacrifices every thing to his self. This is the ideal

contrary of all morality. In order to fall into the realm of morality we must recognize that our *me* is nothing, that individuality is but illusion, that all multiplicity of reality is but the varying manifestation of the one thing in itself—will.

He who has come to a recognition of the fact of the identity of all existences, makes no longer any distinction between himself and others; he enjoys their joys as his own, he suffers their sufferings as his own. The basis of all morality is therefore sympathy or pity. Pity is that mysterious and strange fact by virtue of which the line that, in the eyes of sense, separates entirely one being from another, fades away, so that the non-me becomes in fact the me. Hence there is no basis for a sentiment of so-called duty toward others.

But pity is not the highest form of virtue. The acme is reached only by the complete negation of the desire to live, that is, by asceticism, as practiced by the saints, the anchorets, the penitents of the religions of India and, in part, of Christianity; and the acme of asceticism is voluntary, absolute chastity.

This strange system of ethics evidently supposes liberty of some sort; for if the will were not free, how could it deny the desire to live? But of what sort? This we shall not attempt to make clear. The only kind of liberty Schopenhauer concedes is transcendental, not practical. It is the liberty of the thing in itself, not the liberty of phenomenal action in this world. "Just as every thing in nature has its properties and qualities which, under a specific action, gives a specific reaction, and manifests its character, so man has his *character*, whereof the acts are provoked by motives with absolute necessity." As having his being in the substratum of all phenomena, man is free; as an active phenomenon, he is, like all phenomena, under the law of necessity.

Moral liberty is not to be sought in the world, but beyond it. It is of metaphysical character, and impossible in this natural world. Consequently, our acts are not free; and yet the character of each one is to be regarded as his free act. He is what he is, because, once for all, he has willed and wills to be such. For the will, in itself, and in so far as manifesting itself in an individual, and as constituting his primitive fundamental volition, is independent of all knowledge, because anterior to it.

But how could the one immutable "thing in itself" will individually before the individual existed? How could the

individual before its individuation have constituted itself such as it is, by its own act? This mystery Schopenhauer leaves unsolved. Practically, however, he holds that man, once existing, is ruled by absolute necessity.

Though both man and animals are determined by motives with equal necessity, yet man has the advantage of being able to deliberate, (a fact which has often been mistaken for discretionary choice,) although it is in reality only a conflict between several motives, the strongest of which uniformly causes a necessary determination.

And yet Schopenhauer does, inconsistently enough, bring liberty into the workings of this phenomenal world. Liberty, he writes, is not a dream; for, says he, "the saints in all ages have practically liberated themselves from sin and suffering." And all his prescriptions as to how this blessed life of absolute inactivity is to be attained to, presupposes that the individual has volitional ability to carry them out. This inconsistency does not escape Schopenhauer himself. He admits that practical liberty is a mystery beyond comprehension. He both admits it and denies it.

We have seen that Schopenhauer makes pity the acme of virtue, but holds that to entirely cease to live is a still higher state of the will. Upon what ground do such inferences rest? Upon the ground that all objective reality is illusion, and that the ground of this illusion is *will*.

That effort which is the very essence of all things, is, as we have seen, identical with that which in us appears as self-conscious will. Whatever hinders it, we call suffering; whatever helps it to reach its end, we call satisfaction, comfort, pleasure. These phenomena of pleasure and of pain being dependent on the will are more complicated and intense in proportion as the will is of higher character. Now, as all effort springs of a want, there results pain so long as it is not satisfied. And when it once is satisfied, this satisfied state, not being able to last, there only results a new want and a new pain. To will is, therefore, essentially to suffer; and since to live is to will, hence "all life is essentially suffering."

The higher the being, the more it suffers. The plant has no sensibility, and hence no pain. The lowest *infusoria* suffer somewhat; insects more still. As the nervous system rises in development, intelligence increases, and the animal is more sensitive to suffering. Finally, in man the acme is reached.

And as the man of genius lives more than others, so also he suffers most of all.

> The desire and effort, which are the total essence of man, are like an unquenchable thirst. The very basis of his being is lack, want, pain. Being the most complete objectification of "will," he is, from that very fact, the most needy of all creatures. His very being is a concrete effort and want, an aggregate of a thousand needs. His life is but a struggle for existence, with the constant certainty of being conquered in the end.

Life is effort, and all effort is pain; sorrow or pain is positive; all pleasure is merely negative—a mere lull in the midst of pain. Such is the end which Schopenhauer reaches by speculation; and this end, he claims, is more than abundantly confirmed by experience and observation. Look at poetry, that mirror of the world and of life. The drama and the epic speak universally of anguish, and of defeated efforts after happiness. They never depict durable and unalloyed happiness. And they do not depict it for the sad reason that it does not exist. The idyl proposes, indeed, to paint happiness; but in order to do so it has to be so untrue to real life that the word idyl has come to be equivalent to a dream of youthful inexperience. Facts, as well as philosophy, compel us, therefore, to admit that Göthe was right in seconding the words of Voltaire:—

> Happiness is but a dream; misery alone is real. Such is my conclusion after eighty years of experience. I know of no other course than to submit to fate, and to conclude that even as flies are born to be caught by spiders, so men are born to be devoured by chagrin.

Schopenhauer concludes, therefore, that the world as a whole is thoroughly bad—as bad as it possibly could be—and that optimism is the shallowest sophistry with which miserable men ever attempted to blind their eyes to their own miserableness. Such, contends he, is the voice of all history and of all experience. Go to our hospitals, pest-houses, surgical rooms; go to our prisons and battle-fields; go to the infinite wretchedness of all forms of factory-life. And the millions that escape these outer forms of suffering are a prey to other forms which are none the less terrible from being invisible. Where, in fact, did Dante find the materials for depicting his "Inferno?" In

the warp and woof of our daily life. But when he undertook to describe Paradise, he found his powers of invention taxed to their utmost. Here he had to resort to vague dreams and to second-hand reports through his "Beatrice" and the saints. The sum of the matter, therefore, is, that—

> Life is an incessant chase, in which men, chasing sometimes and sometimes chased, scramble after the tatters of a worthless game —a war of each against all and of all against each—a sort of natural history of misery, the substance of which is this: to desire without purpose, to suffer and struggle without end, and finally to die; and thus, on and on from age to age, until at last the poor crust of our earth shall have frittered itself away into dust and ashes.

Our world being as bad as possible, optimism is but a crying absurdity invented by "salaried philosophers," in order to put themselves into harmony with the "shallow mythology of degenerated Jews and Christians."

The final conclusion of Schopenhauer, therefore, is, that "not to be," is infinitely better "than to be." But what means does he suggest for arriving at the desired goal of non-existence? Suicide? No! for this act is not negative, but positive. The true negation of the desire to live disavows *both* the pleasures and the pains of life; but the suicide disavows only the pains; his very act indirectly betrays in the highest degree a desire of life. His act springs from egoism, which is the very opposite of the required giving up of personality. This position, Schopenhauer justifies also by another argument. His general system teaches that man at birth is "not a moral zero," and that all his good or bad qualities are innate. This presupposes that this life is in some sort the continuation of an anterior life. This is the author's doctrine of metempsychosis or palingenesis. His view seems to be that at death the will and the intelligence fall apart, and that the will, then, finding, or generating, a new body, manifests itself in a new life, without, of course, any recollection of its previous life. Thus life would consist of an eternal circle of births and re-births from death, unless the will should find some means of suppressing its individuality. This means is *knowledge*. But how used? The will, having come to true self-consciousness in the brain of man, sees before it this alternative: either to affirm life and thus perpetuate pain, or to deny life and

come to rest. The decision, if made right, is made by virtue of a superior, transcendent intuitive act of volition, and not by any pretended freedom of choice under the direction of practical precepts. Should this higher volition take place, then man enters "into the kingdom of grace," (as the mystics call it,) "into the truly moral sphere, where virtue commences in pity and compassion, continues in asceticism, and ends in perfect liberation—in *nirvana*." Should this volition take place in all men, then all desire to live will cease; then chastity will become universal; then the race will deny itself as a whole; then its wretchedness and its phenomenal existence in time and space will go down together.

This is the goal which the Hindus expressed by the inadequate words, reabsorption into Brahm, nirvana, etc. We cheerfully admit, says Schopenhauer, "that for those who are filled with ardent desires for life, all that remains after the complete suppression of volition is absolutely nothing. But, on the other hand, what is this outer world of ours, this visible universe, with its systems of suns and its milky way—what is all this, to those who have suppressed all desire? *Nothing!*"

It is not a little curious to see Schopenhauer, after landing in this conclusion, to lay aside his asperities against almost all men and all religions, and to find in the ranks of the mystics and quietists of all ages and nations his own congenial brethren. But the purest form of true mysticism is that of Buddhism. It says:—

Our desires are but as drops of dew, remaining but for a moment. Like the hollow in the hand of a child, they are without substance; like vessels of clay, they crumble in our hands; like the snows of autumn, they vanish as soon as they fall.

Hellenism and Islamism are the only exceptions to the general choir of pessimist voices. Pure Judaism, with its notion of a fall, is thoroughly pessimistic. Pure Christianity is more so still. Adam is the incarnation of the desire to live; Jesus is the incarnation of the opposite—of self-denial. Adam is man as animal and egoistic; Jesus is man as liberated and eternal. Every individual has within himself the possibility of Adam and also of Jesus. Roman Christianity is purer than Protestant; it honors chastity and the ascetic life. Protestantism, in discarding these virtues, has quenched the very heart of Christianity, and "become a bald rationalism"—the

handicraft of indolent pastors. But greater still is the brotherhood of sentiment which Schopenhauer finds in individual mystics. Erigena, Master Eckhart, Tauler, Böhme, Angelus Silesius, Molinas, Madame Guyon, and other more modern writers on the "higher life," have taught for the practical life precisely what he has developed as speculative philosophy. What they instinctively felt and craved after, he has explained and justified before the bar of reason.

Such is a general outline of the philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer. How is it to be refuted? Or does it need any refutation? Is not its sufficient refutation a bare, fair restatement of it in its basal principles and consequences? What other course, in fact, is here practicable? How can there be methodical debate between parties who admit no common ground as a starting-point? If the whole visible world, including our own intellects, is a mere empty delusion, how can the best arguments of either party be less than delusive delusion? If the most certain thing in the universe is a supposed x, of which we know and can know absolutely nothing, where is the wisdom of trying to convince ourselves or any body else of any thing about any thing? We shall, therefore, not undertake any refutation of the system before us. We shall simply summarize a few of, what seems to us, its sins against sound reason.

Thus: It holds that we cannot judge (even partially) of the inner nature of objects from the phenomena and effects which they produce. It affirms that because time and space are not *things*, therefore the world and man, which occupy time and space, are also not things. It identifies will in man with instinct in brutes, life in plants, and chemical affinity in the inorganic world. It annihilates moral freedom, giving to motives the force of physical causation. It affords no intelligible distinction between virtue and vice, right and wrong. It cannot comprehend the conscience. It ignores the law of logic that an effect cannot be superior to its cause, deriving man from an unconscious x, intelligent thought from blind "will." It denies the existence of God, and yet attributes to an unknown impersonal x all the causation which theists predicate of God. Other sins might be mentioned, but these are enough.

In conclusion, it might be asked how such a system came to

be constructed? Why did Schopenhauer become a cynic pessimist instead of an epicurean optimist? His one-sided fundamental construction of Kant would as well have furnished the basis for the latter as for the former. Why he came to prefer the pessimist course must be sought in his education, his temper, and the surroundings of his life. His parents were eccentric: his father, gifted, venturesome—a suicide; his mother, talented, imaginative, worldly. His moral culture was utterly neglected. His early experiences were disappointing and sad. In this atmosphere he constructed his misanthropic pessimist system. The unwelcome with which it met, and the unsuccess of his attempt to win adherents to his views at the university, strongly tended to confirm him in the eccentric views with which he had started out. He simply spoke out that which was in him. Having no inner acquaintance with the restorative power of the only true system of truth, his life experience could not fail to be bitter; and his speculative system was the unconscious reflection of his inner sufferings. Had he had this acquaintance, his system would have been neither pessimistic nor optimistic, but would have presented life as it is—a *mixed* state of evil in conflict with good under the law of moral freedom.

Such is the pessimistic philosophy of Schopenhauer. How has it—(with its repetition in Hartmann's *Philosophy of the Unconscious*)*—come to such wide vogue in the unscholastic classes of Germany? The answer is not difficult. This philosophy is written in a masterly literary style. Its reading is like the reading of a poem or a romance. It addresses the average understanding of the common people. It flatters the cynicism of the vicious and the unhappy. It disarms sin of its guilt. It dethrones conscience, and profanes the holy. It caters to a depraved taste, luxuriating in descriptions of the sexual functions and of every thing in any way related thereto. It dishonors woman, and encourages the selfishness of old-bachelorhood. It is novel, paradoxical, eccentric, piquant. What wonder, then, that for some decades past it has engrossed a large amount of popular attention?

* Hartmann's Pessimism is ably discussed in the *Westminster Review* for January, 1876.

Art. VI.—GOD IN THE WORLD.

The Theistic Conception of the World. An Essay in Opposition to certain Tendencies of Modern Thought. By B. F. Cocker, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Michigan; Author of "Christianity and Greek Philosophy." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1875.

"I am not oblivious of what is babbled by some who, in their ignorance, are frightened at every noise, and say that we ought to occupy ourselves with what is most necessary, and which contains the faith; and that we should pass over what is beyond and superfluous, which wears out and detains us to no purpose in things which conduce nothing to the great end."—Clemens Alex., *Strom.*, Book I, chap. i.

"It is of much more importance to give our assent to doctrines upon grounds of reason and wisdom than on that of faith merely."—Origen, *Contra Celsum*, Book I, chap. xiii.

People still live who sincerely believe that Mr. Moody's method is the only one requisite to convince the world of religious truth. They have heard of the loudly-proclaimed "conflict between Science and Religion," but they maintain that the only way to a pacification is through "evangelical teaching." They have seen the young, in the formative stage of opinion, yielding with an irresistible deference to the evidences which science arrays before the human understanding; but they still suspect that modern scientific conclusions are unreliable. We wish only to define a position which we think wholly mistaken and indefensible. We shall be the last to utter a word of depreciation of evangelical efforts. By all means let them be assiduously promoted. We sincerely honor Mr. Moody and his fellow-evangelists. We only maintain that a large and increasing class of persons exists who cannot be reached by such efforts as long as certain antecedent and fundamental questions of evidence remain unsettled in their minds. We will briefly explain our position.

The work of Dr. Cocker assumes that a conviction of religious truth may be legitimately grounded on data disclosed as the ultimate results of analytical inquiry. The existence of the work implies that though the belief of the multitude may be prompted by their feelings—reverence for teachers, hope of future happiness, devotional susceptibilities—there is a considerable number who demand the *proofs of the realities* which must stand as correlates to the religious feelings.

Belief is a conviction of the truth of some proposition. Conviction always rests on some ground; there is some reason why we believe. Sometimes its ground is *testimony* to a fact

observed. Sometimes it is simply *authority*. *A* entertains a certain belief, and *B*, presuming *A's* belief to represent truth, adopts it, and can give no other reason for his faith. Sometimes belief, sincere belief, is generated or biased by our *interests;* intellectual discernment becomes perverted, and the grounds of belief are not revealed to us in their true light. Sometimes belief is based on the results of a *personal scrutiny* of evidence. George Smith, who has seen and deciphered the Chaldean inscriptions, may feel a confidence in the veracity of our ancient Scriptures no stronger—perhaps, even less unreserved—than that of the servant girl who acquires it from her faithful pastor; but his belief rests on a basis of evidence not traditionary. We who have not deciphered these inscriptions may still accept without reserve the testimony of the antiquary, and, with a knowledge of the nature of the evidence, may build a faith as firm and as logical as that of the original decipherer. Similarly, the chemist notes the transformations which take place in the test-tube, and acquires an original belief in the principle of chemical affinities. He measures and weighs the products of these reactions, and, finding that the compounds present him with definite multiples of the simples, he attains to a belief in the doctrine of "chemical equivalents," and the doctrine of the atomic constitution of matter. The philosopher, introverting his scrutiny, notes the facts of consciousness, and grounds on direct observation his belief in the reality of his conscious states. Here belief becomes knowledge; there is no normal contingency which can invalidate or qualify this intuitive knowledge that he thinks and feels. He finds existent, also, a belief that the *something* to which consciousness refers its states, is a reality, and *such* a reality as is represented in this reference. This belief respecting the existence of an objective reality, and its nature, is accepted by all men as knowledge. It is knowledge exalted above all contingency. These ultimate data disclose an absolute identification of knowledge and belief. Once more, the philosopher discovers reflected in consciousness certain other primary truths which exclude the possibility of all conditionality—such as the principle of causality, the principle of substance, and the principle of intentionality. These he feels to be more indestructible even than matter itself. All knowledge,

all science, is but a superstructure built of these ultimate atoms of truth. The ground of a primary belief is neither testimony, nor authority, nor sensuous observation, nor inductive inference, nor deductive consequence. It is a ground more unassailable than any of these. It is a directness and singleness of intuition of one transcendental and eternal truth. A religious belief is not secure from the attacks of doubt till, by a process of reflection, it has been resolved into these ultimate and adamantine elements.

Now, a moment's reflection suffices to show that men's beliefs possess various degrees of validity. Nor is the ardor of belief graduated to its validity—unless it be in an inverse ratio. One man rests belief on grounds which would not be satisfactory to another. Some persons, like children, willingly adopt beliefs; while others must themselves bring the grounds of belief under the careful inspection of the intellect. Some persons with warm feelings may be easily possessed by beliefs which, in others of cooler natures, must be built on evidence comprehended and weighed; and in persons of similar emotional characteristics, proneness to take advice of the feelings is inversely as the control of intellect.

The *religious* feelings hold the first place in respect to influence over the lives of men. They are not the product of occasional concurrences of circumstances; their existence does not depend on conditions of poverty or wealth, power or subjection, sickness or health, age or sex; they sway the actions of men through the presentation of interests which range not alone over the entire period of mortal existence, but through the dimly glimpsed vistas of an eternal life. All other interests, all other motives, are limited by circumstance, and transitory in duration, save as they condition the religious feelings, which, like the dome of the sky, cover and embrace all that there is in human life.

Yet men differ no less in the intensity and dominance of religious feeling than in intellect, or amiability, or *physique*. Differences which exist absolutely may be counteracted or exaggerated by the other differences which exist—differences in intellect, in education, in fortune, in personal associations. The final resultant of all the forces which influence human actions may be, in one case, an irrepressible religious predisposition; in another,

an emotionless questioning, religious circumspection. The first individual will possess an exuberance of religious faith, though he may be unable to give a reason for it, but will remain legitimately cheerful and happy. The second may deny all religion, though equally unable to give a reason for his denial, but remain unsettled and anxious. Tertullian could believe even *because* a doctrine is incredible;* Pyrrho would not believe even when doubt became absurd. Between Tertullian and Pyrrho stand all gradations.

There is a class of individuals richly gifted with religious susceptibilities, but yet subject to the strong influence of habits of intellectual inquiry. In their ordinary moods, belief can only exist under the previous sanction of intellect; but, in a roused condition of the religious nature, belief bursts into being *at the bidding of the higher intuitions*, and ratiocinative intellect comes afterward merely to sanction its existence.

The intelligent reader cannot hesitate to give indorsement to these propositions. Can there be any difficulty in applying them to the work of convincing men of religious truth? The religious predisposition exists in all men; in most men it is strong. The great mass of people, then, need no arguments; they need only persuasion; they need arrested attention, aroused religious emotions, quickened religious perceptions. To accomplish this must be always the chief work of the religious teacher. It is legitimate; for we maintain not only that the essential propositions of the religion of Jesus are capable of authentication by the most vigorous logic, but that there is a higher apperception of their truth which is glimpsed most clearly by those who attain to the sublimest conditions of religious exaltation. To convince through the emotions—emotions profound and pervading enough to be calm and clear—is to open the intuitional eye, and anticipate the affirmation of reflective intellect.

True it is that the religious teacher whose own belief rests on authority or religious predisposition, may throw the sanctity of religion over tenets which are purely secular or even baseless; and he may thus become the propagator of a volume of crude, if not false and damaging "theology." How sadly is this danger illustrated in the history of even the modern

* "*Credo quia absurdum est.*"—TERTULLIAN.

Church! True it is, too, that the subject of religious exaltation is sometimes simultaneously the subject of a nervous exaltation which quickens the imagination and the whole range of sensibilities; and, in consequence of this, the religious intuition becomes fogged, or even confounded with imagination and physiological impulses. These extravagances of both religious teacher and religious pupil are to be diligently corrected by invoking the calm influences of intellect.

But a different phenomenon, and a different demand, are presented by that respectable minority of persons in whom the religious predisposition cannot be evoked. Though they do not by any means embrace all the thinkers, they constitute, on the whole, a thinking class. The ideas which elevate our civilization, and the enterprises which advance the happiness of the race, originate with them. They unite with strong motive, executive power. They are accessible to argument as well as persuasion. Their attitude toward the tenets and institutions of Christianity will be determined by the claims and pretensions of professing Christians; by the results of a study of Christian evidences; by the awakening power which is brought to bear upon them; by education, example, friendships, or other accidents.

It is the effort to show that Christian faith sounds no dissonance with the universal scheme of truth, which occupies the author of the work before us. *He* does not look unmoved upon the wide paralysis of faith and hope caused by the pernicious influence of this uneducated crusade against science, and this sullen contempt for religion. He presents us a conception of the world, as *framed and sustained by profoundest scientific investigation*, and shows us that it implies God. Here is the text-book for the wavering, and for those who would counsel the wavering. Here is the resolvent for their scientific doubts —doubts which cannot be dissipated by the fervor of a hymn, nor exorcised by the authority of a sermon—the most stubborn and invincible of all the obstacles to religious life.

Let us examine this work. It is not a theory framed by the author. It shows a thorough familiarity with all recent authorities in physical science; and his copious array of citations, connected together, would almost constitute a manual of science in the words of the masters themselves. Indeed, we

feel moved to express our wonder, *in limine*, that an author so thoroughly familiar with the questions discussed should feel it necessary to fortify his statements by quoting so largely the *dicta* of scientists and philosophers. Dr. Cocker, philosopher as he is, is also a scientist, and he possesses the prerogative of speaking by authority; yet he seems reluctant to rest his own logical convictions on their merits. One feels sometimes disappointed that he does not leave a well-reasoned and well-put truth to rest without the bolster of authority. One is led to suspect he may be deficient in the dogmatic spirit. He seems distrustful, at times, of his judgments in matters of physical science; but no person can read the work without feeling that the author's information and clearness of head make him the equal of those whom he cites for confirmation; and this all the more when it is remembered that the disputed points in physical science lie rather within the territory of philosophy than of physics. The explanation of this exuberance of literature is undoubtedly to be found in the author's purpose to put the representatives of science themselves upon the stand to testify in their own words, and thus forestall all charges of misinterpretation. This purpose is judicious, and hastens the finality of the existing controversy. But, aside from such object, the reader will thank the author for opening so many avenues of collateral reading and study.

Viewed as a whole—in its conception, method, and argument—the work is a finished product of broad philosophical reflection, and sheds a genuine luster upon American authorship. It is a high and pure cosmic philosophy. It supplies the co-hemisphere of his former work,* and rounds out with completeness a sphere of cosmotheistic reflection. He has given us the relations of Christianity to ancient thought, and the relations of Christianity to modern thought. In the former, he has not developed as great detail as Cudworth, in "The Intellectual System of The Universe;" in the latter, his details of science occupy the physical, rather than the organic, field, as in M'Cosh's "Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation." Cudworth and M'Cosh have diverged to great distances in certain directions—and so, indeed, have Paley, and Butler, and Chalmers, and the "Bridgewater Treatises;" but Dr. Cocker

* "Christianity and Greek Philosophy."

has described a complete circumference by keeping himself constantly near the central and fundamental position. He has given a greater range of proof; others have adduced a greater variety of illustrations. Spencer* and Fisk,† as far as comparisons may be made, have furnished each an admirable and masterly organon. and Mahan‡ has given a more ostentatious metaphysic; but we think the reader of these authors has need to exercise a degree of discrimination between sound and unsound, which is not required in the study of Dr. Cocker. Starting with the fundamental inquiries which have exercised the thinking world in all ages, the author leads us, by steps of reasoning as lucid as logical, through the realms of philosophy, science, and revelation, to the necessary and vivid conception of a personal Intelligent Will, as the originator, conservator, and governor of the world.

Four answers, he tells us, have been given to the question, What is the First Principle of all things? "In the beginning was MATTER;" "In the beginning was FORCE;" "In the beginning was THOUGHT;" "In the beginning was WILL." The first and second answers coalesce with Atheism; the third with Pantheism; the fourth is the creed of Theism; and this is the answer which is rendered alike by our sacred Scriptures, and by the testimony of recent science.

The idea of God is a common phenomenon of the universal intelligence of our race. An inquiry into the essential nature of the divine originative existence thus revealed, discloses it as "an unconditioned will, or self-directive power, seeing its own way, and having the reason and law of its action in itself alone." Will is conceived as implying *reason*, *affection*, and *efficiency*. This determination of the nature of the first principle is sanctioned by both philosophy and science. Grove, Sir John Herschel, Carpenter, Wallace, the Duke of Argyle, Laycock, Murphy, Challis, and even Comte, unite in affirming that intelligent will is the only rational explanation of the existence and order of the universe. All our acquired conceptions of God fall into harmony with this idea. Whether contemplated under the category of Being, Attribute, or Relation; whether in the light of reason or of Revelation, our total con-

* Spencer: "A System of Philosophy." † Fisk: "Cosmic Philosophy."
‡ Mahan: "Natural Theology."

ception of the Supreme Cause finds its synthetic expression in WILL.

In discussing the question, What conception are we to form of the nature and work of the first origination? the author first considers it in its hermeneutical and metaphysical aspects, arriving at the conclusion that it is the purpose of Scripture to teach the absolute origination of all existence by the power of God, and that the same conclusion is the outcome of the most defensible line of philosophic reasoning in respect to the existence of space and time, matter and force. The absolute ideas of *immensity* and *eternity* he finds imbedded in the depths of consciousness, and he is led by a subtle process of reasoning to regard immensity and eternity as attributes of God; while space and time are relations between co-existing things and successive events, and *apart from things and events have no reality.* Matter, also, derives its existence from the divine will—produced, not out of nothing, but out of the eternal potentialities of the divine nature. The establishment of the conditionality of the existence of time, space and matter relieves natural theology of those fatal embarrassments involved in the admissions of Chalmers, Martineau, Mahan and others. "The creative act was not conditioned by time, or space, or matter."

The conclusion we freely indorse; but it seems to us the discussion of the question, What are space and time? is not yet closed. The affirmation that space and time have no reality apart from things and events is not thoroughly satisfying. It is difficult to apprehend how the existence of body (we use the term for any entity possessing extension) can condition the existence of space. If space, as we agree with our author in maintaining, is the condition of the existence of body, then the existence of space is the logical antecedent of the existence of body, and it must be possible to contemplate spatial existence abstracted from bodily existence—that is, with body non existent. Let the attempt be made; think all material existence annihilated except two atoms of matter. Space, as our author admits, still exists. The space once occupied by matter annihilated, it seems to us, also exists, as before. Now think the last two atoms annihilated, and space, our author says, exists no longer; nothing but the immensity of God remains.

as before creation began. But for us, the space still exists. The fallacy in Dr. Cocker's reasoning, if we may venture the opinion, is a *fallacy in definition;* it consists in adopting an arbitrary definition, and one which does not answer to the universal idea of space. "Space," he says, "is the relation of coexisting material things; that is, the relation of position, distance, direction, hereness, thereness." Accordingly he says, "Let one atom of matter be created and we have extension." That we grant, for extension is an essential property of matter. "Let a second atom be created, and there is now a relation of distance, position, direction—that is, there is *space.*" The existence of the relation alleged is obvious; but we appeal to the common consciousness for the verdict that such relations are *not space.* Having assigned such a definition to space, the conclusion is self-evident, that space was created in the creation of matter, for the conclusion is embraced in the definition; and (as similar reasoning may be employed in reference to time) that time was created in the creation of matter; and that, as a corollary, space and time have no eternal and necessary existence; and creative efficiency was in no way conditioned by them. These propositions are all but different forms of the definition. The last is a most important conclusion for natural theology; nay, we agree with the author that a system of natural theology is baseless which does not rest on this corner-stone. But we feel fully persuaded of our title to this corner-stone even if not derived from the authority alleged; we possess a more valid title than one resting on an erroneous definition.

What is that title? it will be asked. Our first and highest title is based on the necessary intuition of First Cause. The universal intelligence entertains the idea of First Cause, accepts its reality, cannot be driven from a belief in it. There must be one cause which does not exist as an effect. No existence can be prior to that which has the sole capacity to confer existence. Neither space, time, matter, or material force can assert possession of that capacity. It is only when we attempt to reconcile this spontaneous concept of the necessary limitation of the existence of space, time, matter, and force, with the formulated processes and products of reflective thought, that difficulty is discovered, and doubt arises. But suppose the

method of this harmony undiscoverable; we are not bound to point it out. Our difficulty is disclosed in a deductive inference several removes, perhaps, from the first truths from which we argue. Every step opens a possibility of fallacy. Our belief in absolute creation is *primary;* it possesses higher authority than any deduction, still more a deduction which conflicts with it.

But we may *endeavor* to deduce conclusions which shall quadrate with that highest law of belief. The existence of body implies the existence of space; for there can be no extension—not even an atom's extension—without space. It also implies the existence of time; for we cannot separate existence from duration; a thing whose existence has no duration has no actual existence. Space and time, then, are concapacities of body—the conditions of the possibility of body. Time is the sole capacity of unextended being. But time and space have no *dependence* on body or succession. Time exists logically before succession, and space before body; and we may think them as so actually existing. Neither time nor space is the capacity or condition of *absolute* existence. As to absolute being, we cannot affirm that it exists *in* time or space—in eternity or immensity. *God exists*—here and there, prior and subsequent, have no meaning in relation to the Absolute. Space and time, immensity and eternity, are not needed for the existence of God; *nor are they attributes of God;* they were created to serve as the capacities of other existence, or the conditions of the potentialities of other existence. Of the non-existence of space and time we can, indeed, form no conception or idea; our reason knows no denomination in which to formulate that negative; we are part of the same system as space and time, and our intelligence is made the measure of the system to which we belong, and not of another unimaginable system which may be possible with God. Nor is it necessary to form the concept of divine existence manifest, cognizable in all space and time, past and future, and yet characterized by activity not transitive through time and space. There are few things which may be confidently predicated of the Absolute by finite intelligence; and we may be certain that of the legitimate predicates of the Absolute, nearly all must transcend the grasp of human reason to the same

extent as his causality existing out of relation to space and time.

We proceed with our *résumé*. A survey of the phenomena of the actual world soon transports thought backward to a beginning. That the existing *order* had a beginning, is a thesis less debatable than the creation of *matter*. The leading representatives of science are in accord with each other and with the showing of sacred Scripture on this point. Little less contrariety of conviction now obtains in reference to the limitation of cosmical existence in the opposite direction. Science and revelation, with one voice, prophesy an end. If science conduct us backward to a condition of matter which, for her, must be regarded as a beginning, what has she to testify in reference to the nature of matter, and thence, by inference, in reference to the origin of matter? This question affords the author the opportunity to bring science to the witness-box, and the verdict made up from its testimony is alternative: either matter is simply a phenomenon of force, and, therefore, referable to an original creative entity as its ground, or else it is to be regarded, in each of its atoms, as a "manufactured article and a subordinate agent," "precluding the idea of its being eternal and self-existent." This, let it be understood, is the verdict of recent science. Here, let the person troubled about the atheistical tendencies of modern science take hope again, and trust to the voice of God which he hears, as Socrates heard it, perpetually uttered in his own consciousness. Science—*physical* science—affirms that all its data—its *ultimate* data—*are things created.*

Holding thus to the creation of time, space, and matter, and to the finiteness of the existent order, what was the *method* of its beginning? That some motive or sufficient reason for creating was necessary to condition the divine will to activity, is maintained both on purely metaphysical grounds, and on the admissions of philosophers and scientists. The doctrine of Final Cause, then, instead of being exploded, is acquiring new strength, under the sanction of such names as Laycock, Sir William Thomson, Bacon, Müller, and even J. S. Mill. "The highest law of the universe," concludes our author, "must be a *teleological* idea, to which all nature-forces and all causal connections are subordinated. This ultimate purpose forms,

as it were, a complete net-work of higher teleological connections above the web of mere aiteological connections which pervades the universe." As to the nature of the supreme teleological law of the universe, finite intellect may judge inadequately or erroneously; but our Christian Scripture reveals its character as a purpose to "communicate of the divine blessedness to intelligent, personal being." Reasoning from this fundamental principle, it must be inferred that the self-manifestation of God in creation would be *gradual*, *cumulative*, *conservative*, and *harmonious*. A critical examination of the sacred narrative in reference to its general purpose and its literary character shows that this *à priori* inference is sustained; and an inquisition of the facts and conclusions of science demonstrates a complete consonance with the meaning educed from the sacred text.

In drawing out the parallel chronologies of Genesis and geology, we notice but one point which is open to adverse criticism. With Lange and many others, Dr. Cocker recognizes only the first verse of Genesis as belonging to the "exordium;" we feel quite confident the real exordium embraces the first and *second* verses. What is the subject of the statement in the opening of the second verse? The EARTH. "And the *earth* was formless and empty." Now, according to the author, this was before the creation of light—the luminosity of the matter out of which the earth was to be fashioned. Is such an interpretation reasonable? Next, the succeeding clauses depict events *in relation to the earth*. "And darkness was upon the face of the abyss; and the spirit of God brooded upon the face of the waters."* Now, this was an "abyss" revealed in the condition of the *earth* just mentioned, and these "waters" belonged to the *earth* and not to outer space. It is only in the *third* verse that the primordial fact in creation is enunciated; *this is the beginning of the narrative*. The statements of the second verse are to be regarded as detached glimpses—foreshadowings—of some of the mighty events which

*Our author says "vapors," and quotes Lange: "The waters of verse two is quite another thing than the water proper of the third creative day; it is the fluid (or gaseous) form of the earth in its first condition." Now, its first condition was not liquid—if that is what is meant by "fluid"—and an incandescent gaseous fluid would be a singular condition of matter to which to apply a term immediately afterward applied to *waters*. This is a virtual arraignment of the good discrimination, and, so far, the authority of the narrative.

are to pass before us in the hymn; as when in the proemial passage of "Paradise Lost" Milton sings:—

> "Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, *and all our woe*,
> With loss of Eden," etc.

Here, as is universal with the epic poets, some salient facts of the narrative are preannounced. We always picture the sacred writer as gazing upon an inspired vision. The first and highest fact of all is the disclosure of God as absolute originator. Next, as the panorama of creation passes rapidly before him, his attention is particularly arrested, 1. By the formless and empty condition of the arid, scorching surface of the primeval crust; 2. By the chaos—the disorder of, and the absence of correlations in, the features of that surface, and the promiscuity of the aërial envelope; 3. The darkness which hid the earth when the gathered mantle of aqueous vapors excluded the ancient sunlight; 4. The ocean precipitated, and myriad forms of life *hatching* from the waters vivified by the "brooding" "Spirit of God." Of these conspicuous features of the divine work he makes a memorandum and then returns to the beginning, to recount the series of events in its completeness and order. And thus he begins: "God said, '*Let light be;*' and light was."

No difficulty arises from the use of the word evening, on the theory that the first day began with the creation of light. "Evening" and "morning" are not here equivalent to darkness and light; they are practically expressive of the "beginning" and "end" of a demiurgic day. If the "evening" of the first day means the darkness which preceded the creation of light, what means the "evening" of the second day, which followed the creation of light? We think the interpretation here suggested to be demanded equally by critical exegesis and by science.

The next question which arises concerns the present relation of the Creator to the creation. The key-note of the discussion respecting the conservation of the world is struck in the copious citations from sacred Scripture and the authorities of the Church, which represent God as continuously exerting a conserving efficiency, without which creation would sink immedi-

ately into non-existence. Divergent from such a recognition of immanent divine power are the views of "certain advanced thinkers," which our author now proceeds to examine. The first school, represented by such writers as Professor Tyndall, Dr. H. Bence Jones, and Dr. Bastian, hold to "the absolute inseparability of matter and force." While subscribing to the doctrine of primordial creation, they maintain that the phenomena of the universe are perpetuated through the inherent and unwasted energy imparted to matter in the beginning. The second school, represented by such men as Professors Owen, Huxley, and Baden Powell, "deny the ultimate distinction between matter and force, and regard both as phenomenal manifestations of some 'unknown substratum'—a supra-material *physis* (φύσις) which is identical with the divine substance." This is a phase of thought which verges toward Pantheism. "A third and intermediate school assumes the existence of a plastic nature (*vis formativa*) intermediate between the Creator and his work, by which the phenomena of nature are produced." This hypothesis was propounded by Cudworth, and probably possesses a close affinity with the old theory of the *anima mundi;* but it may be doubted whether the "animating principle" of Harvey, the *materiæ vita* of Hunter, or the "organic force" of Müller, or the "plastic force" of the schoolmen, are similarly intended to imply the existence of any separate intelligence. The theory has been lately reproduced by Dr. Laycock and Mr. Murphy, under the name of "unconscious organizing intelligence." To what, it may be asked, does this intelligence pertain? If to matter, the theory means Atheism; if to spirit, it means Pantheism.

Now, every conception of the world which makes it self-supporting, self-evolving, with Deity standing merely as a remote unapproachable prefix, however sanctioned by any theology which styles itself orthodox, is essentially atheistic, and in conflict with Scripture; but happily, also, a conception which is incompatible with the deductions which we are compelled to draw from the data of reason and science. In the defense of this thesis our author displays an admirable familiarity with the theories and speculations of physical science, and gives us, we think, the two most charming chapters of his work. Our limits do not permit even an abstract of his method, and we

can only commend this masterly discussion to the studious attention of those who desire to acquaint themselves with the real positions of the scientists named, and the relations which their science sustains to the biblical doctrine of immanent divine efficiency.

The forms under which Dr. Cocker discusses the leading theories which he opposes are—1. The hypothesis of natural law; 2. The hypothesis of active force communicated to matter at its creation; 3. The hypothesis of a plastic nature. His own views may be summarized as follows: 1. Matter is not a mere phenomenon of force, but is an entity of a purely passive character, serving as the recipient and vehicle of force; 2. It consists of ultimate continuous atoms or molecules; 3. Force cannot be a property of matter; it is an attribute of spirit alone; and spirit-force is the only force in the universe; 4. All the forms of energy manifested in the universe are only transformations* of the one omnipotent force issuing from the one fountain-head of power—the *Divine Will;* 5. All the phenomena of molecular life (bioplasmic phenomena) are the result of the immediate presence and direct agency of God.

Thus the final conclusion is, that "God is not the *transitive*, but the *immanent*, cause of the universe. . . . His ceaseless energy produces all the phenomena of nature." Is not this identification of the dynamical life of the universe with God, Pantheism? To this question he replies: "The theory which represents the Deity as the transitive cause of the universe—a Δημιουργός mechanically fashioning the materials supplied to his hands, and then leaving it to the working of its own inherent forces—is rank Deism. The hypothesis which regards the Deity as *no more* than the dynamical life of the universe—an informing and organizing soul associated with matter—is naked Hylozoism. The theory that reduces all existence, material and mental, to phenomenal manifestations of one eternal, self-existent substance, which evolves itself according to an inward law of necessity, and which is elusively called God, is Pantheism. But the doctrine which embraces the two conceptions of *transcendence* and *immanence*, and, while it teaches the imma-

* On the theory of immanent divine agency, the "different forms of energy" are not "*transformations*" of one divine will-force; they *are* the divine will-force in its various self-imposed modes of activity.

nence of God in matter, proclaims the infinite distinctness in essence between matter and God, and the infinite omnipresence of a personal God above and beyond the limitations of matter, is Christian Theism."

If we recognize the world as created and sustained by divine power, and accept the testimony of revelation that the free and loving impartation of happiness to other conscious being was the final cause of creation, we reach the inquiry, What has been the method of God in the treatment of his rational creatures? What are the phenomena and laws of the providence of God in human history? The conclusion developed from the discussion of this question sets man as an objective point in the geological transformations of the earth, and its successive *faunas* and *floras*, and in the final configuration of the terrestrial surface, and establishes a parallelism between the educational development of the race and that of the individual; transferring the work of human education, in each successive stage, to a new theater, until at length, the stages of Oriental, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman civilization being passed, the Christian civilization seems destined to be fully unfolded and perfected upon a continent presenting, physically and politically, the freest scope for the activity of the appointed agencies of human perfection and happiness.

Descending to a discussion of the question of special providence and prayer, the author strikes what he announces as "the most sharply-defined issue between Science and Religion —in fact, the only real issue at the present time." We are inclined to think this statement quite correct. The old issues of Atheism, Materialism, and Pantheism have vanished in smoke, since we discover it to be impossible to settle upon any well-accepted doctrine of science, from which a simple deductive inference does not usher us into the presence of a personal and adorable Divinity. The discussion of prayer considered from the stand-point of science, is conducted with characteristic learning and conclusiveness; and we think any clergyman, placed under the necessity of vindicating prayer from the aspersions of Professor Tyndall, may find here a mine of pertinent suggestions. "In prayer," concludes the author, "the intelligent believer does not invoke a different power from that which is manifested in all the forms of physical energy which

are manifested in nature; he does but invoke the *same* power, and the *only* power which is the source of all causation, and produces all the processions of phenomena."

The last two chapters are devoted to a discussion of the moral government of the world—its ground, its nature, conditions, method, and end. The *first* subjective condition of moral government is intelligence. In discussing this condition, the author is led to place a definition upon conscience. He does not view it as a distinct faculty of the mind, but rather as the "common field in which is revealed the operation of all our faculties in their especial relation to moral law." It is thus: (1.) "The *reason*, intuitively apprehending moral ideas and laws." . . . (2.) "The *understanding*, apprehending the relation in which we stand to God, to our fellow-beings, and to self as a moral personality endowed with reason and freedom. (3.) The *judgment*, comparing the acts of a voluntary agent . . . with the immutable ideas and laws of the reason, and affirming this is *right* and worthy of praise and reward, or that is *wrong* and deserving of blame and punishment. (4.) A particular state of the *sensibility*—the painful or pleasurable emotions which spontaneously arise in the presence of right or wrong in our actions, or in the actions of our fellow-men."

In reference to this analysis, we cannot avoid raising the query, In what do the intelligential elements differ from reason, understanding, and judgment, in their exercise upon non-ethical data? Is there any adequate ground for dissociating the moral intuitions of the reason from intuitions concerning modality or quantity—except with the view to a classification of the intuitions? And does the understanding, in seizing upon relations which may constitute the *data* of an ethical decision, become a different faculty from that exercised upon relations of utility, efficiency, or congruity? Or does judgment, in rendering its decisions? In every case we respond negatively. There is only a difference in the *subjects* upon which these faculties are exercised. In the analysis of the author, the sensibility is the only power which is *sui-generis*, and this he does not view as subjectively distinct from the general sensibility. His conception of conscience is neat and intelligible, and we quite agree with him that *such* a conscience is not a separate faculty of the soul; it is only a

certain co-ordination of activities upon ethical *data;* it is a dethroning of conscience as an autonomy, and a diluting and weakening of it to a mere complex of functions. In all this, the theory is a violation of the universal convictions on this subject. We think, in respectful disagreement with him, that the composite activity which he views as a function of a conventional conscience, *does* involve an element which constitutes the natural conscience, and one for which we have no name unless we call it conscience. There is no sensibility but this ethical element which constitutes the feeling that "I ought" or "ought not," and which becomes pleasurable or painful according as act agrees or disagrees with that which judgment has pronounced right. Conscience proper, we think, is *not* a discerning faculty, and pronounces no judgments; but when once the discernments have been made and the judgments pronounced by the intellect, conscience, as a feeling * of a peculiar kind, prompts to actions conformable to the judgment pronounced, and accompanies the contemplation of an act with pleasure or pain, according to its conformity or non-conformity with the prompting.

The *second* subjective condition of moral government leads to a discussion of the freedom of the will, the outcome of which (would that space permitted a complete outline of these two chapters) is as follows: Will is original, uncaused cause: it is not caused by motive; "motives may be reason *for* action, conditions under which it acts, but they are not cause *of* action;" or, in the language of Dr. Whedon, "for its own effect, will or the willing agent is a complete cause; as complete a cause as any cause whatever; and every complete cause produces its effect *uncausedly.*" These enunciations, it seem-

* Religion may be defined as *the feeling of the existence of the All-Cause, and of His inevitable grasp upon us, and paternal interest in us.* The "feeling" is primarily intuitive knowledge; it is strengthened and sanctioned by ratiocinative knowledge. The "grasp" felt inspires reverence, awe, fear, desire to please, supplication. The "paternal interest" prompts to gratitude, love, praise, and prayer. The *fear* of God, in the ethnic religious scale, must necessarily precede the *love* of God. The latter is based on a knowledge of what God has done and projected to do *for us.* Hence lowest savages know only a malevolent deity. All the powers of the soul are made ministers to the demands of the religious feeling. Hence religious systems, rites, creeds, institutions, enterprises—all inspired by the unvarying religious feeling, but all reasoned out and executed by finite and erring intelligence.

to us, cut to the marrow of the subject, and harmonize the fact of universal motivity with the fact of conscious freedom.

One cannot complete the thoughtful perusal of this work without a feeling of high admiration and profound satisfaction. There has passed before his mind a vision of heavenly beauty. The grand conclusion shines in upon him like a divine illumination, and he feels absorbed in an atmosphere of supernal radiance and tender love. It is a vision of God, of his own free will resolving to create a world and populate it with beings physically adapted to it, but yet in his own spiritual image—beings to be made happy; a vision of God *in* the world, maintaining it, communing with it, admitting himself into the consciousness of his beloved intelligences; speaking to them in the voiceless whispers of reason, in the radiant beauties of the field and the sky, or in the awful voices of the storm and the earthquake, and the collapse of planetary systems; God *with us*—Immanuel—strengthening and cheering, lifting us up and pitying us in our distresses, watching for the whispered prayer, responsive to the hymn of adoration, enfolding us with his love through all the journey of mortal life, and then, when the light of the cerulean heaven fades in our glazing eyes, revealing us to ourselves in the midst of a light which mortal eyes cannot behold, and which floods with ineffable glories that other world from which we are now shut—not by distance, but by life.

An author who can bequeath his readers an impression like this has earned a title to gratitude, to fame, to an eternal reward.

Art. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

Baptist Quarterly, April, 1876. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Logos. 2. The Assyrian Canon. 3. The Church. 4. The Pioneer Baptist Statesman. 5. Mortal or Immortal. 6. Forgiveness and Law. 7. Progress in Theology.

Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1876. (Andover.)—1. The Cyropædia of Xenophon; Its Historical Character, and its Value in the Illustration of Scripture. 2. Horæ Samaritanæ; or, a Collection of Various Readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch compared with the Hebrew and other Ancient Versions. 3. The Relation of Theology to other Sciences. 4. The John Carter Brown Library. 5. On the Reading "Church of God," Acts xx, 28. 6. Relations of the Aryan and Semitic Languages. 7. Dr. Hodge's Misrepresentations of President Finney's System of Theology.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, April, 1876. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Preacher's Need of Mental and Moral Science. 2. Unconscious Enemies of Christianity. 3. The Essential, the Important, and the Indifferent. 4. About God and Creation. 5. The Resurrection of Christ. 6. The Instability of Science, and the Incomparable Stability of the Bible. 7. Genesis and Geology. 8. The Question of the Hour.

CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, April, 1876. (Boston.)—1. William Alfred Buckingham. 2. The Doctrine of Sanctification at Oberlin. 3. David Bacon. 4. Ministry and Churches of New Hampshire. 5. Congregational Theological Seminaries in 1875–76. Congregational Necrology.

NEW ENGLANDER, April, 1876. (New Haven.)—1. Reasoned Realism. 2. The Value of Classical Studies. 3. Intercollegiate College Regattas, Hurdle-Races, and Prize Contests. 4. John Dwight of Dedham, and his Descendants. 5. Sons of Liberty in 1755. 6. The Recent Troubles at Eton College. 7. Are all Criminals Insane? 8. Theory and Method of Preaching.

NEW ENGLAND HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL REGISTER, April, 1876. (Boston.) 1. The Lowndes Family of South Carolina. 2. The Hon. Marshall P. Wilder's Address before the New England Historic, Genealogical Society, January 5, 1876. 3. A Yankee Privateersman in Prison in 1777–79. 4. Record-Book of the First Church in Charlestown, Mass. 5. Brief History of the Register. 6. Extracts from the Diary of the Hon. William D. Williamson. 7. The Proprietors of the Sudbury-Canada Grant. 8. Marriages in West Springfield. 9. Documents Relative to the Expedition to Port Royal, 1710. 10. Abstracts of the Earliest Wills in Suffolk County, Mass. 11. The Folsom Family. 12. Notes on American History, No. 7.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1876. (Boston.)—1. Dr. Cutler and the Ordinance of 1787. 2. Montezuma's Dinner. 3. The Consular System of the United States. 4. Chief Justice Chase. 5. The Reform of Local Taxation.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, April, 1876. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Recent Studies in Christology. 2. The Cosmology of Paradise Lost. 3. Importance of Teaching the Bible to the Children. 4. The Truth's Testimony to its Servants. 5. The Ministerium. 6. The Theology of the Seventeenth Century. 7. The Roman Catholic Question.

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM, a Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly, April, 1876. (Nashville, Tenn.) 1. Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History. 2. The Old Irish Church. 3. Who Was Melchisedek? 4. Religion and the Constitution. 5. Christianity as an Element in Education. 6. The Doctrine of Causes, No. 2.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1876. (London.)—1. The Three Creeds. 2. Messianic Views of the Modern Jews. 3. The Means and Measure of Holiness. 4. Fragments on Preaching. 5. The Negative Tendencies of the Age. 6. Salvation and Baptism: An Excursus on 1 Peter iii. 21. 7. The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ. Translated Article: Theiner's Acts of the Council of Trent.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, April, 1876. (New York: Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 41 Barclay-street.) 1. Connop Thirlwall, Bishop of St. David's. 2. Recent Scotch Novels. 3. Railway Profits and Railway Losses. 4. Lord Mayo's Indian Administration. 5. Lindsay's Merchant Shipping and Ancient Commerce. 6. Lord Albemarle's Reminiscences. 7. Capponi's History of the Republic of Florence. 8. Secondary Education in Scotland. 9. Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1876. (New York: Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 41 Barclay-street.)—1. Green's History of the English People. 2. Sir William and Caroline Herschel. 3. Plate and Plate Buyers. 4. Taine on the Old Régime in France. 5. Kashgar, Pamir, and Tibet. 6. The Keppels: Fifty Years of My Life. 7. Utilitarianism and Morality. 8. Mr. Swinburne's Essays. 9. Church Innovations.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1876. (London.)—1. Vedic Sanscrit. 2. The Threefold Crucifixion in the Galatians. 3. The Spiritual Conflict before and after Regeneration. 4. The Bonn Conference. 5. Christian Populations in Turkey. 6. Comparative Missionary Statistics. 7. Charles Wells. 8. Opium in India and China. 9. Assyrian Discoveries.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1876. (New York: Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 41 Barclay-street.)—1. Our Colonial Empire. 2. The Legal Position of Women. 3. Scottish Universities. 4. Ouida's Novels. 5. Rousselet's Travels in India. 6. "Free-will" and Christianity. 7. The Civil Service.

The following notice by a skeptical reviewer of a skeptical author, whose two works issue from New York, indicates that our American writer is no very reliable champion of unbelief:

Dr. Inman's pathetic preface would of itself disarm criticism; but his work on "Ancient Faiths and Modern" really contains a number of accurate and important facts calculated to lead the reader to a more historical estimate of Christianity. We are no admirer of his former work on "Ancient Faiths Embodied in Ancient Names," in which he commits as many acts of treason against philology as there are pages in the book. The present work is, happily, not based on names, but on published collections of myths and legends, and on translations of sacred books, which can be verified. Of critical tact, indeed, there is little or no display; but the argument, though quite in the rough, is effective. Christianity is not an unique religion, but rooted in nature worship, and its sacred books are a medley of "gold, silver, precious stones, hay, stubble." There still, however, remains the question, What is it that gives the biblical literature and the biblical religion its strange fascination to the children of the West? Granted that it has grown up naturally, granted that it is equaled or excelled in many points by other religions, is there not an undefined something which justifies its claim to be the religion of the highest races of the world so long, that is, as they need a religion? And is this undefined something really undefinable? Dr. Inman appears to deny this stamp of superiority, but he writes in the spirit of the advocate, and has no true sympathy with the religious spirit in any of its manifestations. His own sketch of a religion of the future, on page 473, is of the most unidealistic character.—P. 240.

The following gives us one of the latest specimens of palæontology:—

The excavations carried on in the cave known as the Kessler-loch, near Thayngen, in Switzerland, by M. Merk, brought to light a great number of traces of the existence of prehistoric man in this

locality; and Mr. Lee has rendered good service to the English student by publishing a translation of the excellent memoir in which M. Merk recorded his discoveries. The fauna of the cave clearly shows its occupation to belong to the reindeer period, and is remarkably rich, nearly all the species found in the whole of the Belgian caves having been furnished by this single locality, while several which do not occur in the more northern district are found in the Swiss cave. The most numerous remains are those of the horse, reindeer, wolf, Arctic fox, Alpine hare, and ptarmigan. The only human bone found at Thayngen is the collar-bone of a young individual; but the works of man's hands in the shape of implements of stone and bone, and ornaments of bone, stone, and brown coal, were exceedingly abundant. The stone implements are all of palæolithic type, but those fabricated from the bones and horns of various animals are often elaborately worked and ornamented, reminding us of those from the south of France, so well described and figured in the "Reliquiæ Aquitanicæ of MM. Lartet and Christy, the publication of which has lately been completed by Professor Rupert Jones. Among other points in common between the Swiss and French relics, we have the occurrence of a good many engraved representations of animals. The figures found at Thayngen are chiefly of the horse and the reindeer; there is also an outline of the hinder part of an animal resembling a pig, and a sculptured fragment representing the head of the musk sheep, (*Ovibos moschatos;*) outlines of a fox and a bear are open to some doubt as to their genuineness. Mr. Lee's translation is furnished with a few notes and an appendix, and illustrated with impressions of the original plates.—P. 259.

It will be here seen that while we have implements whose rudeness is supposed to indicate the most degraded barbarism, we have them mingled together with specimens of apparent semi-civilization. What does this juxtaposition prove other than that the cave dwellers were unskillful flint workers, but skillful horn-workers and gravers?—that is, the remains indicate character rather than time. If the flints prove extreme antiquity the horns prove extreme recency, and so cancel the argument.

Of Mr. H. H. Bancroft's great work on "The Native Races of the Pacific Races of North America," in five volumes, we have the following notice:—

Of the volumes which contain the results of Mr. Bancroft's zeal, outlay, and labor, it is impossible to speak at all adequately here. Very rarely indeed, in modern times, has so mighty a task been undertaken, and no one could have faced it without the spur of patriotic feeling in addition to the conditions of energy and wealth. It is, of course, easy to pick holes in this work, as in any other

which covers so much ground; but the judicious critic ignores trifling faults in a work which comprises all that has yet been learned or suggested on a vast subject, and which will be for a very long—perhaps for all—time an indispensable companion to every student of American archæology. Our own Lord Kingsborough anticipated Mr. Bancroft in spending unmeasured toil and money on the antiquities of America, to his own ruin, alas! Mr. Bancroft, the head of the great Californian publishing house, has broader shoulders fortunately. His volumes do not look so costly as Lord Kingsborough's, the great outlay on which was caused by their reproduction, in color, of the Mexican picture-writings; but their compilation must have involved no less expense, while they are more useful. Mr. Bancroft's modesty is as conspicuous as his energy; he professes to have limited himself to the collection of known facts, leaving to others the construction of theories. The earlier part of this work was noticed in our recent article on *Savage Life*, (April, 1875.) Of the three volumes before us, the first (vol. iii) treats of myths and languages. These myths, most numerous and various, are well classified under the chief points, on which we find ourselves in contact with the supernatural or unknown. Merely noting that the Ahts of Vancouver Island possess a Darwinian theory that men "first existed as birds, animals, and fishes," we pass on to the languages, which are hopeless in number and variety, though Mr. Bancroft thinks that they may be assembled into three great families. Volume iv treats of antiquities, fascinating and awing us with its many wood-cuts of the weird, long-abandoned buildings and monuments of Central America. In this portion of the work Mr. Bancroft owes much (as he acknowledges) to Stephens, Squier, Catherwood, and to M. De Waldeck, who went to America for Lord Kingsborough, and who died a centenarian at Paris last year. With these wondrous buildings and their graceful ornamentation, and the vast quantity of hieroglyphics, some of which are of a date later than the European conquest, it is maddening to think that the superstitious intolerance of the Spaniards has made the knowledge of these nations and their records a thing past hope. In looking at the views of Copan, Uxmal, and Palenque, we are forcibly reminded of the monuments of Southern India. The constant use of relief, and the faulty and singular style of design, are common to the two regions, as is also the frequent rectangular *façade*. A still more striking resemblance is found in the richness of the architectural details, the character of which is also like. The Indian sitting posture, too, is found in America, notably in the famous bas-relief at Palenque, the figure in which sat (for it is now destroyed) with one leg bent up, exactly like the Hindu Mahadeva. The sloped ceilings of Uxmal and Palenque are singularly like the well-known Etruscan Regulini Galeassi tomb. *Das Buch ist ein neuer Beweis der Allgemeinheit des Phallismus, oder wenigstens des allgemeinen Eifers der Gelehrten den Phallismus überall zu finden. Im Lateinischen zu sayen id quod Teutonice diximus; hoc opus demonstrat*

aut phallum ubique in veneratione habitum esse aut saltem doctos velle venerationem phalli semper et ubique invenire.—Pp. 272, 273.

The whimsical delicacy of the reviewer in giving in two languages, and not in English, his notice of the diffusion, real or imaginary, in ancient America of the obscenest of all the old world idolatries, is amusing. We may have occasion to recur to this most singular and mysterious matter in our October number.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April 1, 1876. (London.)—1. Jonathan Swift. 2. Ignatius—his Testimony to Primitive Conceptions of the Christian Religion. 3. The Progress of Reform in Russia. 4. "The Bible Educator." 5. Disestablishment in New England. 6. Poor-Law Relief in and out of the Workhouse. 7. The Atonement. 8. The Present Aspects of the Church Question.

We called the attention of our readers not long since to the very able work of Mr. Southall on "The Antiquity of Man." The obstacle to the popularity of this volume is the very fullness of its work and the massiveness of the book. In reading the following notice of this work from a former number of the "British Quarterly," it must be remembered that this Review is generally somewhat Darwinian and intensely English. The closing sentences are, therefore, the reluctant concessions of a possible evolutionist and a most real John Bull.

The author of this work is enthusiastic for his cause, but his discretion and judgment are scarcely at all times equal to his enthusiasm. He enters the lists against those he terms the "scientists" with the greatest ardor and gallantry, and he deals them many a hard and heavy blow; but he endeavors to occupy too much ground. As with Americans generally, his plan—like everything in the country—must be on a big scale. The result is, that while we have abundant materials drawn together, often of great value, they too frequently assume the appearance of a miscellaneous collection, without the unity of connection that distinguishes a true book. We cannot say that Mr. Southall's "Recent Origin of Man" is free from this blemish, notwithstanding his evidently assiduous labors in connection with it, and the zeal with which he fights for his views. The Transatlantic aspect of the work, moreover, will militate against its acceptance on this side, though the forms of expression to which critical English readers will object be in themselves as justifiable as many in use at home. Those who are not deterred by these blemishes may be assured that they will find a formidable array of arguments in "The Recent Origin of Man" against modern theories which have come to be generally accepted, but are seen on a closer examination to be without sufficient evidence. The readiness with which the most comprehensive theories are built upon the most slender

array of facts is made manifest repeatedly by Mr. Southall. The announcements of science with regard to the antiquity of man are shown to have been premature, and to have been constantly varying, so that every few years some scientific novelty—generally an old foe with a new face—is presented as the final solution of the mystery of the universe.—P. 228.

German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Edited by DR. HILGENFELD. First Number. 1876.—1. HOLTZMANN, The Development of the Esthetic Idea of Religion. 2. ZELLER, The Peter Question. 3. HILGENFELD, Peter in Rome. 4. HARNACK, Contributions to the History of the Marcionetic Churches. 5. GRIMM, The most recent Investigations on Consul Lucius.

1876.—Second Number. 6. HILGENFELD, Hegesippus. 7. GORRES, The Martyrdom of Abbot Vincentius of Leon and his Companions. 8. TOLLNER, Servetus' Pantheism. 9. KOHLER, Rabanus Maurus as Writer. 10. RONSCH, Contributions to the History of the Itala. 11. A. BAUR, Interpretation of Matt. xix, 23–26.

The old question, Has the Apostle Peter ever been in Rome? constitutes in the second and third articles of this number the subject of a friendly and learned controversy between Professor E. Zeller, the historian of Grecian Philosophy, and Professor A. Hilgenfeld, the editor of this journal. No new material has been used by either of the two writers, and no new points of view could, therefore, be gained; but the two sides of the controversy are here presented by equally eminent writers in a lucid and exhaustive manner. Hilgenfeld defends the traditional view that Peter has really been in Rome, and chiefly relies on a passage in the First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, which speaks of the martyrdom of Peter at Rome. Zeller denies the cogency of this argument. He admits that the first canonical Epistle of Peter assumes the presence of Peter at Rome during the persecution of the Christians, but he claims for this epistle a very late origin, about the time of Antoninus Pius. The controversy consequently turns upon the time when the Epistle of Peter was written. Here the testimony of Eusebius that Papias, who lived and wrote before that time, had made use of this epistle, is a point of great importance. Zeller impugns the testimony of Eusebius, and denies that Papias had any knowledge of the epistle. The controversy has little to do with the Roman Catholic legend of the episcopate, or even primate of Peter at

Rome. The assumption that Peter held at any time the office of bishop of Rome is as decidedly denied by Hilgenfeld as it is by Zeller, and, in general, by all writers who are not Roman Catholics. According to Hilgenfeld, Peter did not go to Rome until the Roman captivity of Paul, between the years A. D. 62 and 64.

In the fourth article, Dr. Harnack, of the University of Leipsic, gives some contributions to a history of the Marcionitic Churches. The essay comprises: 1. A critical review of the report of the Armenian bishop, Esnig, on the Marcionites, on the basis of a better German translation than the first one given in 1834 by Dr. Neumann, (*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie.*) The report of Esnig acquaints us with Marcionites, whose doctrinal system has remained uninfluenced by that of the Manicheans. 2. An account of an important Marcionitic inscription found in Syria, in which a Marcionite church edifice is called *συναγωγή*. A special treatise is added on the meaning of the word *συναγωγή* in the ancient Church, which is said to be identical with *ἐκκλησία*. 3. An authentic document on Marcionitic psalms. 4. An investigation of the value of the *Carmina Pseudotertulliani adversus Marcionem;* or, a History of the Marcionites in the West.

In the sixth article, Professor Hilgenfeld reproduces all the fragments of the lost work of Hegesippus, entitled *Ὑπομνήματα*, or, Memorials of the History of the Church from the Birth of Christ to the Time of Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, who succeeded Anicetus in A. D. 170. These fragments are of great importance, as Hegesippus was one of the earliest writers on Church history. His reports bear a Judaizing coloring, and the Tübingen school sees in him a determined antagonist of Paul.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. (Journal for Church History.) Edited by Dr. TH. BRIEGER, Professor at the University of Leipsic. First volume, first number. *Treatises and Essays:* 1. WEINGARTEN, The Origin of Monasticism in the Post-Constantine Age, (First Article.) 2. REUTER, Bernhard of Clairvaux. 3. RITSCHL, The Origin of the Lutheran Church. *Critical Reviews:* The Work on Church History published in the Year 1875. The History of the Church to the Council of Nice. By A. HARNACK. *Analecta:* 1. TSCHAKERT, The Spuriousness of the Pretended Dialogues of d'Ailly: De quærelis Franciæ et Anglie and De jure successionis utrorumque regum in regno Franciæ. 2. Volz, Christoph Walther, the Proof-reader of Wittenberg. 3. SCHAEFER, A Contribution to the History of Protestantism in France.

This is the first number of a new periodical of Protestant theology. It is wholly devoted to Church history, and takes

the place of the "Journal for Historical Theology," edited by Kahnis, which was discontinued at the end of 1875. The publisher announces that for the present it will not be published in periodical intervals, but that as soon as possible four numbers will be published annually, which will constitute a volume. This first number is incomparably superior to any number of the former periodical. The three essays are all from Church historians of established reputation, and of general interest. The first article, by Professor Weingarten, of Marburg, investigates the origin of monasticism, and undertakes to prove that it did not originate, as is generally assumed, during the persecution of the Christians by the Emperors Decius and Diocletian, but after Constantine. The accounts of Paul of Thebes, "the first hermit," as he is generally called, are, according to Professor Weingarten, exclusively based on a work of Jerome, *De Vita Pauli Monachi*, which is one tissue of absurd miracles, and utterly unworthy of an earnest historian's attention. The foundation of monasticism by St. Anthony, the patriarch of Cœnobites, rests likewise on very unreliable reports. The principal source of information concerning him is a work entitled *Vita Antonii*, which is generally ascribed to St. Athanasius. A number of distinguished historians have previously endeavored to show that this work has either not been written at all by Athanasius, or has been much interpolated. Professor Weingarten argues with the former, and finds in the genuine works of Athanasius sufficient proofs that he cannot be the author of the work, *Vita Antonii*. Having rejected as unfounded and untrustworthy the traditional accounts of the origin of monasticism, the author begins his investigation into the real origin of this peculiar institution. The article will be completed in a following number of this journal; but we already see that he finds the origin of monasticism in the service of the Egyptian god, Serapis, on which recent discoveries in Egypt have shed a new light. He states that in connection with the service of Serapis a monastic system was organized, the history of which can be traced, by means of authentic documents, through many centuries. He calls attention to the fact that the first traces of Christian monasticism are met with in the neighborhood of famous temples of Serapis, and that many names of the

ancient Serapis temples again occur in the early history of Christian convents.

The sketch of Bernhard of Clairvaux is from the pen of one of the most distinguished Church historians of Germany, Professor Reuter, in Breslau.

The review of the literature published in 1875 relative to Church history of Dr. Harnack is a work of great merit and interest. It surpasses in point of completeness any thing of the kind that has been attempted in other departments of theology, and, if regularly continued, will make this new journal very valuable to all who take an interest in Church history. The works reviewed are chiefly German, with some French, English, and Dutch. They are grouped into five chronological sections: 1. The Apostolic Age; 2. The Post-Apostolic Age; 3. The Gnostics; 4. Literary History of the Ancient Church, from Justin to Eusebius; 5. Political and Constitutional History of the Church to Constantine.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE. (Christian Review.) February, 1876.—1. NAVILLE, The Educational Question. 2. SABATIER, Father Hyacinth, (Second Article.) 3. MASSEBIEAU, New Communication on Cordier.

March.—1. REUSS, Jerome Savonarola. 2. PENEL, Ethics and Progress. 3. GUEL, Aid and Charity in their Relations with Social Questions. 4. CRESS—The Church Question and its Solution.

April.—1. BERSIER, A Collection in the Apostolic Age. 2. MATTER, The C— between Science and Religion. 3. MASSEBIEAU, The last Play of M. Aug— the Question of Divorce. 4. PRESSENSE, Some Remarks on the Religious M— ment inaugurated by Mr. Pearsall Smith.

The article by Naville, an old and regular contributor to the *Revue Chretienne*, on the educational question, treats on the proper relation of State and Church to schools, with special reference to the recent legislation of Switzerland. The *Revue Chretienne* has been known for years as being decidedly opposed to the legislation of Germany and Switzerland on religious matters. Though the new laws are chiefly intended to guard against the dangers which the leading statesmen of these countries anticipate from Rome, the *Revue Chretienne* regards them as incompatible with the spirit of religious liberty. The new educational laws in Switzerland appear to Naville in the same light. He charges them with endangering the liberty of private instruction, and with monopolizing the education

the entire rising generation in the interest of a party which he believes to be hostile to Christianity. Entering into a discussion of the question of denominational and undenominational schools, the author rejects the entire exclusion of the religious element from the public school as injurious to the pupils, and advocates that the fundamental principles of Christianity, in which both Protestants and Catholics agree, be made the basis of the public school system. To illustrate his idea of a Christian, undenominational, public school, he refers at length to a flourishing school, in the Canton of Fribourg, in which a liberal Catholic priest, Father Girard, during the years 1804 and 1823, carried through this principle. In view of the great interest which in all civilized countries is taken in what the author justly calls the great educational question of the day, this article of Naville's will find many attentive readers, though his views, in the present state of European society, have no prospect of adoption.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The year 1875 will be memorable in the Church history of Germany for the introduction of the synodal constitution into the kingdom of Prussia. Of the eight old provinces which constituted the kingdom before the annexation of Schleswig-Holstein, only two, the Rhine province and Westphalia, have long been in possession of synods; the six eastern provinces were until 1874 without any representative assemblies, and wholly governed by royal consistories. The Prussian Government has for some time been preparing the introduction of synods into these provinces, and the convocation of a general synod for all the eight provinces. A practical beginning was made in 1874, when "circle synods," (*kreis-synoden*,) consisting of clerical and lay members, were organized in all the circles, (subdivisions of provinces.) In the spring of 1875 the first provincial synods, consisting of clerical and lay delegates from the circles, assembled in the eastern provinces, and on November 26 an extraordinary General Synod met in Berlin to discuss the draft of a new church constitution, which the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of Berlin (*Oberkirchenrath*) had prepared. The Synod was composed of clerical and lay delegates chosen by the eight provincial Synods, and of thirty members appointed by the king. The United Evangelical Church of Prussia has three large parties which widely and irreconcilably differ in their doctrinal views: 1. The Lutheran, or "Orthodox-confessional," Party, which contends for the strictest adhesion to the Lutheran symbols

of that portion of the Church which originally was Lutheran; 2. The Middle Party, which is anxious to preserve the union between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, and is opposed both to extreme Lutheranism and liberal Rationalism; 3. The Liberal Party, which professes the rationalistic views of the Protestant Union, (*Protestantenverein*.) The present government supports with its entire influence the Middle Party, which, partly in consequence of this influence, was successful in most of the provincial Synods at the election of delegates. Without this influence, it was thought the majority of the delegates might have belonged to the orthodox-confessional Lutherans, who enjoy the energetic support of the aristocracy, and displayed in the provincial Synods a much greater strength than was anticipated. Nearly all the thirty members appointed by the king belong likewise to the Middle Party, which, therefore, controlled at the General Synod a considerable majority. The Liberal, or Rationalistic, Party made a very poor show, as no more than three of its members were elected, two by the provincial Synod of Brandenburg, and one by that of Silesia. The General Synod elected as president Count Stollberg Wernigerode, one of the foremost statesmen of Prussia. Although only thirty-nine years of age, Count Stollberg has been for two years president of the Upper House of the Prussian Diet, and was early in 1876 appointed German embassador at the court of Vienna. The expectation is quite general in Germany that he will be the successor of Prince Bismarck as Chancellor of the German Empire. The office of vice-president was filled by the election of Pastor Dr. Nieden. The draft of a church constitution, which had been prepared by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, was adopted, with some amendments, by 134 against 62 votes. When the officers of the General Synod had an audience with the king, he again emphatically expressed his determination, as he does on every suitable occasion, to adhere to the faith in which he had been baptized and confirmed, and to protect the United Evangelical Church.

The Church which, by the adoption of this constitution, will enter upon a new career, is the most numerous and powerful Protestant body of continental Europe. According to the official statistics, which the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of Berlin caused, in 1874, to be collected and published, the United Evangelical Church embraced in the eight old provinces of the Prussian monarchy a population of about 12,250,000 persons, or 61 per cent. of the entire population. A majority of the population belongs to it in the four provinces of Pomerania, (97 per cent.,) Brandenburg, (95 per cent.,) Saxony, (93 per cent.,) and Prussia, (70 per cent.;) while in the four other provinces, Silesia, (47 per cent.,) Westphalia, (45 per cent.,) Posen, (32 per cent.,) and the Rhine province, (25 per cent.,) it is numerically inferior to the Roman Catholic Church. The number of churches, chapels, and meeting-houses is 9,412, giving one place of worship for every 1,304 evangelicals. The largest number of Churches is found in Saxony (2,604) and Brandenburg, (2,391,) the smallest in the Rhine province, (561,) Westphalia, (436,) and Posen,

(325.) The highest per centage of churches to population is likewise found in Saxony, (755 persons to one church.) The other provinces follow in this order: Pomerania, (988,) Brandenburg, (1,138,) Posen, (1,573,) Rhine province, (1,620,) Westphalia, (1,850,) Silesia, (1,855,) and Prussia, (2,824.) In the city of Berlin there were at the close of 1873 only 63 churches and chapels, or one to every 12,646 persons belonging to the United Evangelical Church. The number of clergymen is 6,581, giving one clergyman to every 1,865 persons. The proportion of clergymen to population is most favorable in Saxony, most unfavorable in Prussia. In Berlin there are 6,928 persons to one clergyman.

The new Prussian provinces of Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, and Hesse-Nassau have as yet each a separate Church constitution. But here, as well as in the smaller German States, an organic union of all the Protestant State Churches of Germany, with an Imperial General Synod, is desired by many, and resolutions to that effect are annually passed by a number of ecclesiastical assemblies.

Hitherto the only official bond of union between the Protestant Churches of the German States have been the meetings of delegates of the supreme ecclesiastical boards of the several States, which under the name of Evangelical Church Conferences have been biennially held at Eisenach. In 1875 an extraordinary meeting of the Conference was held to deliberate as to what attitude the Churches should observe in view of the recent introduction of civil marriage. The Conference was unanimous in recognizing all marriages concluded in accordance with the new civil law as fully valid, and resolutions were passed to make in the ecclesiastical marriage formularies those changes which the obligatory priority of the civil marriage act necessitates.

Though not officially united, the German Churches co-operate in a large number of religious societies. The three great parties more and more separate from each other, and try to improve the efficacy of their party organization. One of the oldest and largest religious societies of Germany is the Gustavus Adolphus Society, the object of which is to aid in the establishment and maintenance of Protestant congregations in Catholic countries. It is under the control of the Middle Party. Its annual meeting was, in 1875, held at Potsdam. The annual income was reported as 231,000 thalers, (a thaler being equal to seventy-two cents,) which were distributed among 1,184 congregations. Since the foundation of the Society 4,012,000 thalers have been divided among 2,486 congregations. During the past year 112 new congregations were added to the list of those receiving support, and 21 were stricken off as having become self-supporting. The Society embraces 1,207 local associations, 380 women's associations, and 6 students' associations. Among the recipients of aid are congregations in all parts of continental Europe and in several countries in South America, and the reports from the different countries constitute one of the most interesting features of the annual meetings. Of special interest, in 1875, were the reports from Spain, Italy, and Brazil.

The Liberal, or Rationalistic, Party has its chief organization in the Protestant Union, (*Protestantenverein,*) which, in September, 1875, held its ninth annual meeting at Breslau. Representatives of one hundred and twenty-five local associations were present at the meeting, which was also attended by the deputies from the Swiss Reform Union, the Protestant Union of Holland, and the Unitarians of England and the United States. A declaration was adopted that the deplorable indifference in religious matters of a large portion of the Protestant people was partly caused by the wretched condition of the present form of divine worship, which needed an immediate and radical reform. The principles on which this reform should be based were the subject of a protracted discussion.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A new work on the relations of Galilei with the Roman Court, by E. von Gebler, (*Galileo Galilei und die Römische Curie.* Stuttgardt, 1876,) is represented by competent critics as the most thorough and correct account of this interesting subject which has yet been published in Germany. The new documents which have recently been published by M. de l'Epinois and S. Gherardi have been carefully used, and the entire extensive literature on the subject has been compared. With regard to one of the controverted points, the minutes of Feb. 26, 1616, which the Inquisition produced in the second trial, and which represented Galilei as promising to the Commissary of the Inquisition, and in the presence of a notary and witnesses, that he would entirely abandon the Copernican theory, and in no way teach it in future, this author agrees with those who regard the minutes as a forgery. Professor Reusch, of Bonn, the editor of the "Theologische Literaturblatt," who some time ago published a very interesting essay on the subject, (it appeared first in the "Historische Zeitschrift," and subsequently as a pamphlet,) adheres to his view that the minutes were genuine, but had no legal force as they had not been signed. The same scholar, in a recent number of his journal, (*Theolog. Literaturblatt*, April 9, 1876,) gives a full account of a new Italian book by Pieralisi, (*Urbano VIII. and Galileo Galilei.* Rome. 1875, which publishes some new documents, and has not yet been used by Gebler. Pieralisi undertakes to prove at great length that Galilei was never tortured, a view in which both Gebler and Reusch concur. The opposite view had, in 1873, been defended by the Italian deputy, Mazzoleni, and has quite recently found another supporter in the Waldensian clergyman, Revel, (in the Protestant Italian Journal, "Rivista Christiana," April, 1876.)

A new edition of the Apostolic Fathers, (*Patrum Apostolicorum Opera* Leips., 1875,) which promises to be superior to any former, has been begun by Drs. Gebhardt, Zahn, and Harnack. It was originally under

taken as a revision of the valuable edition of the Fathers by Dressel, (first edition, 1857, second edition, 1863,) but the changes and additions are so many that it may be looked upon as an entirely new work. The first number, which has just been issued, contains the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistles of Clemens Romanus, the fragments of Papias, and the Epistle to Diognetus. The editors give a complete list of all the works relating to any of the fathers, and thoroughly discuss all questions as to authenticity, time of compilation, etc. According to them the Epistle of Barnabas was compiled between 71 and 132; the (first) Epistle of Clemens between 93 and 97; the so-called second epistle of Clemens between 160 and 200; the epistle to Diognetus between 170 and 300. The editors were unfortunately not able to avail themselves of a very important discovery which has been made in Turkey, namely, the first complete Codex of the two epistles of Clemens. Hitherto these epistles were only known from the incomplete and damaged Codex Alexandrinus, which Patriarch Kyrillos Lukaris, of Constantinople, well known in history for his friendly disposition toward Protestants, sent as a present to England. Now the Metropolitan Philotheos Bryennios, of Seres, in Macedonia, has published (in Constantinople, 1875) the complete edition of the epistles, from a manuscript made in Jerusalem in 1056, and preserved in Constantinople. The same Codex contains also the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Epistles of Ignatius. Prof. Hilgenfeld announces that his new edition of the Epistles of Clemens, which will appear during the summer of 1876, will contain all the new matter contained in the edition of Bryennios.

Of the best edition of the Christian apologists of the second century, the *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Sæculi Secundi*, edited by Professor Otto, of Vienna, which, in 1872, was completed by the publication of the ninth volume, the first volume, containing the works of Justin, appears in a third edition. The first volume has just been published, (Jena, 1876.)

The want of a thorough work on the venerable Bede has long been felt, and now been supplied by Prof. Karl Werner, one of the best authorities on the Church authors of the Middle Ages, (*Beda der Ehrwürdige und seine Zeit.* Vienna, 1875.) The first chapter of his work treats of the history and condition of the Anglo-Saxon Church previous to the time of Bede; the second, of the Anglo-Saxon convent schools—the convent school of Wearmouth Yarrow, where Bede spent his life as a far-famed writer and teacher. The following six chapters are an exhaustive treatise on the literary activity of Bede. The author announces that his work on Bede will be followed by others on prominent ecclesiastical writers of the Middle Ages.

FRANCE.

An interesting contribution to Christian patrology is a work by B. Aubé on S. Justin, (*S. Justin, Philosophe et Martyr.* Paris, 1875.) After a brief account of the first persecutions and the moral condition of the

Roman Empire at that time, he treats of the life and age of Justin, of the circumstances under which the two Apologies were written, of the philosophy of Justin in its relation to Stoic Platonism, and especially of the mutual relations and analogies of the Christian Doctrine and of Paganism, according to St. Justin.

A work from the same author on the persecutions of the Christian Church, (*Histoire des persécutions de l'église jusqu'à la fin des Antonins*, Paris, 1875,) is regarded as one of the most important publications on Church history which have appeared in 1875. After giving two introductory chapters on "Dissensions in the Primitive Christian Church," and "Sufferings of the Christians Previous to the Persecutions of Nero," the author describes in the six following chapters the character and the history of the persecutions under Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. An appendix contains two essays on the legality of Christianity in the Roman empire during the first century, and on the martyrdom of St. Felicitas and her seven sons. The work is written in an attractive and fascinating style, and based on a most thorough acquaintance with all the sources of information.

The literature on the Council of Trent has received a most valuable addition by the publication of a work of Dr. Döllinger, (*Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient.* Nordlingen, 1876.) As the title indicates, it contains a number of reports made, and diaries kept, by bishops and officers of the Council. All of them are now published for the first time. Among the documents of the volume is a report on the preparation for, and the beginning of, the Council from Serpando, general of the Order of St. Augustine, subsequently cardinal, a diary of the Council by Massarelli, the secretary of the Council; a report on the progress of the Council by Gonzalez de Mendoza, Bishop of Salamanca, and a diary by Bishop Pseaume of Verdun.

A new work on the manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburgh, by Harkavi and Strack, (*Catalog der Hebräischen Bibel-Handschriften*, St. Petersburgh, 1875,) gives a curious account of one of the most remarkable literary forgeries of the age, which is all the more interesting as it concerns manuscripts of the Bible. The manuscripts referred to form the most valuable collection of the kind in any public library. There is only one of still greater value at Tchufut Kale, in the Crimea, but that will probably be also purchased by the Russian Government for the Petersburgh library. Both these collections were made by the almost incredible zeal of a Caraite Jew of the Crimea, Abraham Firkovitch, who died in 1874 at the age of eighty-eight years. Even when more than eighty years old, this man undertook long journeys to the East to search for new manuscripts. His attention was specially devoted to the genizas, or cellars, beneath the synagogues, in which the Jews frequently conceal old damaged manuscripts of the Bible, in order that they may decay without being violated by the hands of man. It is natural that valuable discoveries can be made in these places. Unfortunately, Firkovitch tried to enhance the real value of the discoveries

manuscripts by the most shameless forgery. He changed the dates in the signatures of the copyists, and in the notes concerning the sale or donation of the manuscripts, and, besides, made many additions of his own. According to the falsifications made by him, some of the manuscripts even belonged to the time before Christ, while a very large number was compiled during the first ten centuries of the Christian era. If genuine, these discoveries would have been of an astounding character, for thus far we had only a few manuscripts belonging to the tenth century, and not a single one of an earlier age. It was, therefore, natural that the genuineness of these remarkable manuscripts should be looked upon with suspicion; but a noted Orientalist, Professor Chwolson, vehemently defended them, and even Tischendorf censured the rashness of the doubters. But several other members of the Russian Academy noticed the obvious discrepancies between some notes of the manuscripts and well-known facts of history, and the new work of Harkavi and Strack proves the fraud, that has been committed in a manner which leaves no room for further doubt.

The first good biography on Bernardino Ochino, one of the most celebrated Italian Protestants of the sixteenth century, has been recently published by Benrath, (*Bernardino Ochino von Siena.* Leipsic, 1875.) Ochino was a Capuchin monk, and vicar-general of his order. He was not only the glory of his order, but was regarded as one of the first pulpit orators of Italy. By reading the works of the German Reformers, and by his personal acquaintance with Valdez, the foremost representative of the Reformation in Spain, he became convinced that the pope was the antichrist. He fled to Switzerland; was for five years pastor in Augsburgh, when Charles V. demanded his surrender; sought, in 1547, refuge in England, where he obtained considerable influence under Edward VI.; was again compelled to flee by the edict of Bloody Mary; became pastor in Zurich, from where he was expelled on the charge of heresy; fled to Poland, and had, at the age of seventy-seven years, to leave this country again to escape persecution by the Catholics. German papers praise the work as one of the best written biographies relating to Church history.

Art. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Daily Christian Advocate. Folio. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1876.

It was a happy, though unintentional, coincidence, that the General Conference of our centennial year should be held in Baltimore—"old Baltimore"—redolent with so many reminiscences of our past history. With "old Baltimore" we had our battles in the days of slavery; but they have passed, leaving nothing but fraternal and honoring memories behind them. And the members of this

General Conference will, we believe, cherish a cordial recollection of the various Methodisms, once *one*, but now *divided*, there residing. Sectionally and denominationally distinct, an era of peace is dawning, looking to a future of spontaneous spiritual oneness, in which former and present denominational boundary lines will lose much of their significance.

The earlier public sessions of such a body seem dilatory and employed in trifles. But during these early sessions the real work is being distributed and performed by the great Committees. These Committees are truly sub-Conferences, which take each its share of business, and thoroughly and earnestly consider it; and their report is the result of their best brain labor. Those reports cannot be completed until the latter part of the session. Then they come in rapidly, and as these often require little more than the sanction of the Conference, masses of business are finished which have been industriously matured during the whole session. The earlier public sessions do, indeed, furnish room for an abundance of trivial propositions, which are referred for due entombment to the proper Committee. In particular, the soft-brained brother who proposes to mutilate the Apostles' Creed by abolishing that grand old word "Catholic," put in his usual quadrennial appearance, illustrating how enduring is the generation of innocents.

The addresses of the various delegations were a most interesting feature of the session. Of course, the first in honor were Messrs. Rigg and Pope, both from their high personal reputation, and from our reverence for the island Church who is the mother of us all. Most heartily received, also, was the frank and manly address of our fine old Calvinistic foe and brother, Dr. Patton, from the Presbyterian Church. With Dr. Patton we staunchly hold to a creed, and fully recognize that our two creeds are not one; but these necessary differences of the understanding lie in a stratum altogether below that higher concord of the Spirit in which we are one. The modifications made by Augustine, and still more trenchantly by Calvin, are a special phase, but no fundamental change in the great, immutable, generic theology of the Church. The addresses of the fraternal delegates from the Church South were eloquent and hearty, and heartily received. Such arrangements were made as will, we trust, establish fraternal relations forever, to be confirmed by a catholic union of the various bodies of, at least, American Methodism.

Perhaps no more touching words were addressed to the Confer-

ence from a sister Church than came from the African Methodist Episcopal Church, under signature of Bishop Payne and others:—

"*Most reverend Brethren:* With joy we hail the day that once more permits us, as fellow-laborers and sufferers in the bonds of Christian faith, to greet you in the capacity of Church counselors assembled. Heretofore, by our connectional standing, we have realized the strength of our relationship. You have seemed nearer to us than any other great body of Christians in the world, because we have drawn life from your doctrines, models from your laws, and grace from your examples. Your Methodism has been our Methodism; your pioneers our pioneers. The realizations of times gone by are stronger to-day than at any preceding period. We feel in Christ that we are brethren by blood, by denomination, by doctrine, by our peculiar law. You and we all stand upon the apostolic principles of John Wesley, and, as Methodists, practically ought to be near each other. We should feel the pulsations of only one heart. May God, for his own glory and the good of his Church, draw us to one common center!"

This Conference was conservative-progressive. Special efforts had been made to render it a Conference ready for fundamental changes. The essays in the editorial columns of one or two of our leading Advocates more than four years ago, in favor of quadrennializing the Episcopacy, had been followed by the maintenance of doctrines in Church polity heretofore almost unheard of in our Methodism. Under so powerful an influence a general spirit of questioning almost every point in our system arose. A discussion ensued, unjustly characterized by the "Independent" as "a furious newspaper war;" unjustly, we say, for it was, though an earnest, an eminently fair and courteous discussion. Yet the movement brethren did, in some sections, carry the discussion into the delegate elections, producing in some instances unfortunate results. Sensational announcement appeared in the "New York Herald" of a whole programme of fundamental changes, followed by nearly as sensational an announcement in the "Independent." Of course all such outside pyrotechnics were conducive to reaction. If we are specially sensitive against any thing, it is against sensational pressures from any outside or hostile sources assailing our Church institutions. Still it was not reaction from the discussion of change that mainly produced the result. The fact was, that as the discussion advanced the clearer it became that the changes were, in themselves, not only reversive of our system, but, as partial changes, unproductive of the expected good results.

Quadrennialization and abolishment of episcopal ordination did not venture to utter a word for themselves. Modifications of the Presiding Eldership were decided to require a constitutional change. We believe this last to have been strictly the true ground. Yet it stands clearly on record that either and all these changes can be constitutionally made. Our Episcopacy, our Presiding Eldership, and even our Itinerancy, exist by the voluntary will of the Church, and must justify their existence by the results they produce. But there are some things which nominally ought to be held settled. "Progress" is a very fine word; but it depends entirely on the direction the progress takes, whether it is a very fine thing. Stability is also, in its place, a blessing and a condition of success. There must be axioms in reasoning and fundamentals in institutions. The reason why the English people possess constitutional freedom and the French have seemed incapable of that attainment is, that the former hold their foundation stable, while the latter can blow up and blow down a constitution at two successive puffs. It will stand to the recorded honor of this our centennial General Conference that it has placed some things, not among the immutables, but among the reasonably permanent. Not that any future discussion is to be at all suppressed or held disloyal; but a perpetual questioning of settled points will present little inducement. Inside innovations and outside assaults may give themselves a settled repose.

The evils of Conference "patronage," and of canvassing for the election of officers of the Church, and especially of the intrigues of self-seeking candidates, have called out some very strong expressions both before and during the Conference. How far these evils justify the vivid pictures and intense language employed we have had no personal means of actually knowing. We have never been a member of any General Conference by whose vote we were placed in our present position. Our visits to the Conference have usually been brief, and under disqualification for mingling in the discussions, public or private. A just sensitiveness, no doubt, that should make self-seeking or "log-rolling" fatal to a man's claims, cannot be too stringently maintained. On the other hand, any exaggeration and over-talk upon this subject, which we are inclined to believe exist, are unjust and injurious. There must be a rational amount of discussion as to the fitness of men, and the wishes of sections to be represented by the men. It is a very captious ethic which denounces this fair discussion as "electioneering," and a spurious piety that styles it "the prayer-meeting

superseded by the caucus." It can hardly seem probable that in the present General Conference, where so large a number were elected unanimously and of course, "electioneering" was a prominent trait. Our own belief ever has been that the support of a "clique," or any strenuous efforts to attain place by management, has generally been fatal to a man's ambition. Near the close of the first quadrennium of our editorship, a gentleman, not a member of our Church, said to us, "I suppose you are leaving no stone unturned to secure your re-election." Our reply was, "I have not lifted my finger for such a purpose. It is not with us as it is in politics. When a man among us is known to be intriguing for a place he is very sure to be defeated. Our only way to secure re-election is to perform our duties well." We did suppose this reply to be truth. And if it be true, then the over-vivid pictures on this subject are not only false but calumnious. We mean not so much calumnious against the officers elected; but calumnious against our General Conference and our ministry. It is a serious business to teach our people and the outside world that our ministry, especially the most eminent in its ranks, is a set of intriguing politicians. We fear that this has been thoughtlessly done by some of our best thinkers.

The striking statement is made that there was one general officer of the Church to every ten members of the General Conference! How correct the arithmetic of this awful statement, we have not done the cyphering to ascertain. But we have a still more sensational statement to make. Every member of that General Conference was a salaried officer of the Church; elected, we know not by how much self-seeking, electioneering, and caucussing, in the Annual Conferences, lay or clerical! And every individual, of at least their clerical constituency, being a pastor, was a salaried officer of the Church, elected or appointed by "patronage," lay and clerical, to the office and place he fills. So that this numerical proportion of the General Conference officers of the entire Church, covering the whole United States and more, whose business covers the coming four years, to the members of the General Conference seems to lose something of its impressiveness. The world is full of "officialism" and "patronage." Our various systems—political, literary, mercantile, and industrial—are systems of "officialism" and "patronage." Every regular work for recompense is an "office," and every selection of the workman is "patronage." In order to go out from the system of office and patronage you must needs go out of the world.

These general utterances against "officialism" and "patronage" seem to be forming into a *platform* looking to a fundamental change of our Church constitution. Such platform in its glimmering outlines seems to be limned in an article headed "General Conference Patronage" in "The Methodist" of May 27. So gallant has been the support rendered by that paper, under both its former and its present editor, to the polity of our Church when assailed for long years by our "great official," that we are not ready to impute any purposed disintegrationism to its utterances. Whether such possibility is not foreshadowed in the following, among many other sentences of that article, our readers can decide:—

As a rule, the only effective check upon the evils of patronage is to destroy patronage. When Mr. Gladstone opened the civil service of England to competitive examination, he opened the purest political epoch England has known. There is among us a struggle between a system that creates patronage and one that renders it practically impossible. The Church has long hesitated, and is still hesitating, between the two ways. On one road every newspaper is published by an official editor, and in every benevolence the gifts of persons flow through official channels. On the other, newspapers depend for their support upon the measure in which they command respect, and diverse channels for benevolence are diverse. Neither way is *now* the best way. Existing facts compel compromises. But the Church will some day have to choose between those two ways, and those who prefer what may be shortly termed officialism may well take care lest startling cases of corrupted patronage do not lead to a settlement of the issue under the force of a resistless impulse rather than under the slowly-matured conclusions of reason. The Church wants to keep a pure Church life, and whatsoever smells of corruption is doomed to destruction, slowly or swiftly, as it may fall under our judgment or wither under our righteous wrath.

On this passage and its previous paragraphs let us note:—

1. It misstates the issue here prospected. The issue is not as to the existence or non-existence of "patronage," but as to the hands that shall dispense said "patronage." In its very terms of statement "The Methodist" prefers to take the "patronage" sooner or later from the General Conference and place it in the hands of some self-elected individual or association. Of this last method of "patronage" an eminent instance exists in one of the ablest papers of our day, which styles itself "The Independent." In this establishment there is a larger amount of "officialism" and "patronage" than in any one periodical of our Church. And all that "officialism" and "patronage" are in the hands of one man, whom we name with entire respect, Henry C. Bowen. If we rightly recollect, in the days of its youth and weakness it acted as organ for the Congregational body. But when the great ability of its proprietor had made it strong, it shook off that "patronage" and set up for itself. It is a rare specimen of suiting itself to a variety of customers, and so fills, for better or worse, perhaps, a need of the day. But its "officers," or rather *employés*, take all their

official life from one man. They are selected, perhaps, in his back parlor. If he chooses to strike the "evangelical" department from its columns and substitute an "atheistic" one in its stead, it needs but his stroke to do it. And so it becomes powerful by courting the current of the day and precipitating its rapidity. As an arena in which opposing opinions may state their case, one such paper may have its "mission." But is it a model for the periodicals of our Methodist Episcopal Church?

But what we wish here to specialize is, that in changing to such a system we do not "destroy patronage;" we only take it from the Church and surrender it to an individual or a company. By the one system the editors are the hired men of the proprietors. Their owner perhaps bargains with them in his sanctum, and to his pleasure must they submit. By the other method it is the Church in public counsel, who selects the editor from all her men in open day, and by fair ballot. Such a method makes these editors officers not of one man, but of the whole Church. The Church has control of the doctrine they teach. And there can be no great corruptive action or effect in the matter which does not come from the previous corruption of the Church herself. Against any such change, now and ever, we stand the firm opponent, until we see reason for disintegrating and abolishing the Church itself.

2. The article we have quoted evidently has only the editorial offices in view, but all its statements strike not only at our editorships, but at our connectional system. Its logical sweep abolishes the Methodist Episcopal Church. To "destroy patronage" you must "destroy" not only our periodical system, but our episcopacy, our missionary organization, our itinerancy, and our very ministry itself; nay, you must destroy our colleges and universities, for all are "officialism" from top to bottom, and all dispense "patronage." And if you are going to do the work of destroying "patronage," etc., do it honestly and thoroughly; carry it into our political and industrial institutions and land yourself in communism. And, finally, let the proprietors of "The Methodist" renounce all "patronage," and its editor all "officialism," and the "self-denying ordinance" will be complete.

3. As to the uninspired prophecy about "cases of corrupted patronage," by which something or other "is doomed to destruction," the editor is indebted to his vivid imagination for his facts. We do suppose that even the proprietor of an "Independent" may be the object, truly or falsely, of the most terrible pub-

lic scandal; but is that a reason for destroying the system of "independent" papers? If a bishop, or an editor, or a book agent is guilty of corruption, the proper judiciary is amply prepared and ready for his arraignment. Every man of our official body is under careful supervision, as Mr. Bowen is not. If the allusion, however, be to a "corrupted patronage" by the General Conference in the election of a bishop or an editor, we take it that the Church will not for such an instance destroy the General Conference, or the Episcopacy, or even the elective franchises of the General Conference. That would be like Peter Pindar's blockhead, who burnt his barn in order to destroy its "patronage" of a nest of rats. Happily we do not, as a Church, act under any such paroxysms as the editor descries in our future.

We confess to some personal feeling in this matter. We have been six times elected to the quadrennial office which we fill, and it is the satisfaction and glory of our life that those elections have not been the choice of a mere private corporation in their evening upstairs conclave, but deliberately made by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of these United States, after a pure and unbargaining canvass each time of the whole Church, by repeated unanimities, and always, after the first election, by overwhelming majorities. And we will take our turn at offering a prophecy, which shall be also a prayer, that we may be followed by a long line of successors, elected with equal purity, by the same body, to attain a far higher success in the performance of their duties.

Commenting and Commentaries: Two Lectures addressed to the Students of the Pastor's College, Metropolitan Tabernacle, together with a Catalogue of Biblical Commentaries and Expositions. By C. H. SPURGEON, President. 12mo. pp. 200. London: Passmore & Alabaster. 1876

As a bluff and burly evangelist for the London crowds, Spurgeon has been very effective; but when he starts for a biblical critic he steps outside of his qualifications both of intellect and education. A laughable illustration of this are the two following contrasted opinions of Whedon's Commentary; the former extracted from his "Sword and Trowel," and the latter from this volume —

> Hodder & Stoughton have done well to try this work in the English market; many a Sunday-school teacher will feel himself a rich man when he has this volume in his possession.

> Dr. Whedon lacks common sense; he is no expositor. He is furiously Calvinistic, and as weak as he is furious.

The secret of this ludicrous self-stultification, we suppose, is that the first was his notice of the first volume, and the second of the

third volume, which has the infinite presumption to furnish an anti-calvinistic interpretation of Romans. The two notices cancel each other, and the zero that results is, of course, the value of Spurgeon's opinions on the subject.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., and JAMES STRONG, S.T.D. Vol. VI, Me–Nev. 8vo., pp. 997. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

This great work travels with so majestic a steadiness down the alphabet that we cherish a serene hope of living to see its Z. We see no decline in the ability of its articles or the fullness of its plan. No previous Cyclopædia covers its ground. It is a library of rich, accurate, and modern learning within its departments. In the present volume the most elaborate articles are Methodism and Methodist Miracles, Missions, Monasticism, Mormons, and Musical Instruments. The psychological articles, however, as that on Liberty in the last volume, and those on Mind, Motive, and Necessity in this, are rather slender performances.

The Central Idea of Christianity. Revised Edition. By JESSE T. PECK, D.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 12mo., pp. 396. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1876.

This work, of which a new and revised edition is just published, has long been accepted among us as a standard on the subject of Holy Living. The subject is presented in a rich variety of aspect, in a mellow, lucid, and often eloquent diction. Holiness of heart and life is present as both a duty and a blessing. He emphasizes rather the deep and serene style of Christian life than the vocal and over-demonstrative; that which beams out from the pure and conscientious deportment, rather than that which would be unperceived were it unproclaimed.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Early Man in Europe. By CHARLES RAU. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 162. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Unfortunate is the book whose very first sentence is a stupendous untruth. Such is the misfortune of the book before us, and the sentence is in the following words:—

> All races of the earth, it is now well understood, were at a certain period of their existence so little advanced in the arts of civilization that necessity compelled them to employ wood, bone, horn, shells, but especially *stone*, as the materials for manufacturing their simple tools, weapons, and objects of personal adornment.—P. 11.

Now the country which all tradition affirms to have been the cradle of the human race, Babylonia, the plains of the Euphrates, furnishes no excavated prehistoric *stone* whatever, and no physical evidence of any period when metal was not used. All the natural phenomena, as well as the archæology and all ancient memories, agree in affirming that a man here began, and began in possession of civilization. It is for pseudo-scientific romancers like Mr. Rau to show, as there is nothing in his book to show, that the earliest European man was autochthonic, and did not immigrate as a stream westward from this primordial oriental center.

What is true of Babylonia is also true of Egypt. There are no prehistoric stone implements in Egypt. Stone implements are there found; not, however, emboweled in the earth, but in tombs, and in use with instruments of other material. So that Mr. Rau's first sentence is a flagrant misstatement. In the first primeval centers, where history finds primeval man, all the evidences are that primeval man was civilized man.

A second leading sentence on the second page is like unto the first, and likewise false:—

> Thus we have for the Old World three succeeding phases of human development—the Ages of Stone, Bronze, and Iron—which demonstrate that man slowly and gradually emerged from a condition of utter barbarism, and ultimately, after long continued struggles, advanced toward the highest state of modern refinement.—P. 12.

That men do exist at different times in such different conditions is no doubt true. There are men in the stone grade now. But that these three grades have so existed in Central Europe, or anywhere else, as to furnish any chronological measure, or any proof than "man" (meaning, of course, the race) "slowly and gradually emerged from a condition of utter barbarism," Mr. Rau does not show, and we believe it is out of his power to show. It may be freely conceded that a greater roughness of flint workmanship, confirmed by other evidences, may indicate a less civilized, and so an earlier date. But races do recede in civilization as well as advance: so that the rougher may be the earlier implement. And it is preposterous to claim the power of telling how long it will take a people to pass from a chipped flint to a rubbed and smoothened one. Sometimes very poor stone implements are made, either from haste or from unskillfulness, contemporaneously with better ones; the former will be, alack! *paleolithic*, and the latter *neolithic*. And when a tribe sinks into utter barbarism and mental imbecility its stone tools are very likely to be as stupid as every thing else about them. So far as the

implements are a measure, they are rather a measure of the grade of skill, than a measure of time. The poorer classes will often use stone where metals are in use by the rich and royal. Some tribes of ultra-conservative character will retain old habits and implements long after improved modes are in their reach. There are sections of people in Norway who lived for many centuries in full communication with the users of iron, and *yet persisted in the "stone age" until the beginning of the eighteenth century!*

Mr. Rau seems not to have heard from Schliemann. Schliemann dug on the hill of Hissarlik for the Homeric Troy, and he found more Troys than he had calculated. He found with his spade four successive cities as he descended. The lowest, which was of course chronologically, the *first*, presented him with a rich abundance of weapons and tools made of bronze, copper, diorite, granite, greenstone, flint, and lava; that is, *metal and stone were primordially used together.* The second city is identified by Schliemann as the Homeric Troy. There he found a higher civilization, but the same abundant use of both metal and stone. So that *here we have two successive blended metal and stone ages!* City the third, and chronologically later, is *almost exclusively stone!* The metal age thus is ancient and the stone age is modern! So that we have demonstrably this whole theory of stone antiquity reversed, and laid flat upon its back.

Now if, as is almost unquestionable, this second city was the Homeric Troy, we know approximately its date. It was not far from 1300 B. C. So that we have here a *stone age* about the era of King David preceded by two metal ages. We have a right, therefore, to ask: Was it want of knowledge, or a want of fairness, that prevented Mr. Rau from noticing a fact presented before the intellectual world so conspicuously, and so destructive of his chronological theory, as this excavated Troy?

Mr. Rau gives a list and description of the so-called "extinct animals," with whose bones the remains of man have been found so associated as to indicate contemporaneity. He does hint very slightly that some of these lasted to rather a late period; but he does not furnish any thing like a fair view of the great body of evidence which shows that most of these animals lasted late into the historic period, indicates that some of them are not even now "extinct," and so invalidates all their value as measurers of time. He mentions and describes the mammoth, the Irish elk, the rhinoceros, the reindeer, the hippopotamus, the cave-bear, the cave-lion, the cave-hyena, the urus, and the musk-ox. Now the urus, the rein-

deer, and the Irish elk, there is good reason to believe, lived in Europe as late as the twelfth century, and the aurochs to within a century ago. As to the mammoth and elephant, their bones are found in similar latitudes in America in such conditions as to justify the opinion that they lived within the date of late European history. The cave-lion was not perceptibly different from the present species of lion, which existed in Thessaly, Greece, so late as the time of Xerxes. The cave-bear still exists in our grizzly bear; and the cave-hyena Lubbock identifies as little different from the existing spotted hyena. The hippopotamus and the lion were found by Schliemann in company with the swine, delineated on the pottery of the Troad. Association of human bones with animal in Europe does, therefore, not carry man back beyond the oriental historic period. The biblicist can draw on more than five thousand years to account for European man; he does not absolutely need four thousand.

Be it noted that there are good proofs that some animals of centuries ago were adapted by special modifications to the climate they had to endure. Of this fact Mr. Rau has the fairness to make the following concession, a concession very fatal to his theory of human antiquity:—

> The climate of Europe, as we already observed, must have been more rigorous at that period than at present. Yet the cave-lion and hyena, and particularly the hippopotamus, elephant, rhinoceros, etc., would seem to indicate a warm rather than a cold climate. The question is certainly a perplexing one, from whatever point it may be viewed. The reader knows that the elephant and rhinoceros of that period, unlike the almost hairless species of our day, *were covered with a dense fur consisting of wool and hair, which enabled them to endure an arctic temperature.* The tiger of Southern Asia, it is adduced, has been seen in Siberia as far north as the fifty-second degree; and in the North of Africa hyenas are known to prowl about the highest regions of the Atlas Mountains, where during winter a severe cold, with ice and snow, is reigning. Of the extinct carnivores, moreover, the bones only have been found, and nothing is known of their external covering which may have been suited to a cold temperature, and the same argument is brought forward in reference to the hippopotamus.—Pp. 30, 31.

There are two other vital points, however, on which Mr. Rau omits to make, as he should, similar fatal concessions, namely, the value of *stalagmite* floors, and of *peat* formations as *measures of time*. In regard to the former he makes the following correct statement:—

> Limestone rocks are remarkable for being traversed by many fissures and crevices, presenting natural conduits through which the atmospheric water is carried into the interior of the mountains. This water possesses the quality of dissolving to some extent the lime with which it comes in contact. In reaching the caves, it trickles from the roofs and the sides, and, having evaporated, deposits its contents in the shape of thin layers of carbonate of lime wherever circumstances favor that process. The incrustations adhering to the roof, which gradually have acquired the form of icicles, are called *stalactites;* while those on the floor appear like conical

columnar elevations, designated as *stalagmites*. Often these pendent and rising formations have met, presenting pillars or buttresses, or have assumed other strange shapes, in which the tourist, who views them by the flickering light of a torch, imagines to recognize curtains, cascades, organs, statues, altars, and other odd figurations which his fancy may suggest. How many thousands of years were required for building up these sometimes colossal accumulations of calcareous matter cannot be determined, considering that the increment may not progress in an invariable ratio even in the same cave; but in order to show how slowly the deposit sometimes increases, we will mention that in the celebrated cavern of Adelsberg in Illyria, names and dates traced in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries can be deciphered even at present, the incrustation formed since that time not having acquired a thickness sufficient to hide those inscriptions.—P. 38.

Now, while giving this last proof of the great slowness of stalagmite formation, why could he not also state the proofs of its great rapidity? That rapidity depends upon the amount of lime, of water, and of carbonic acid present. And when these conditions are present a floor a foot thick could be produced in half a century. There are instances in which human remains are covered with thick stalagmite floors, and that has been quoted as proof that they had lain there millions of years, whereas it does not prove two thousand years.

From the peat bed at the Somme, calculating its growth to be infinitesimally slow, Mr. Rau quotes Sir Charles Lyell as deducing a period frightfully long. And yet Mr. Rau must know that the growth of peat depends upon conditions which can render it very rapid, conditions really existing, not now but in earlier times, in this very Somme valley.

Equally slender and one sided is Mr. Rau's account of this celebrated instance of the banks of the Somme, where the proof of the antiquity is based on the great depth, thirty-six feet, of the implements. The excavator, Mons. Boucher de Perthes, is the original and main authority. And his testimony destroys, over and over again, all the value of the proofs of high antiquity. In his successive diggings de Perthes tells us he found at the depth of twenty feet a Roman amphora; at twenty-four feet he found an ivory statuette which he believed to be that of St. Lawrence; at thirty-five feet he found pieces of Roman copper. All these finds, and more, demonstrate that these banks have been deposited since the Roman era began in France. There are ample geological proofs that they are not twenty-five hundred years old.

We do not say that there are no strong proofs of the pre-Adamic man, but we do say that these phenomena in Europe are not among the proofs. It is not proved by the phenomena of extinct animals; nor the rudeness of stone implements; nor the depth at which they are buried; nor the stalagmite floors; nor the peat layers that cover them. On the contrary, the facts go to indicate that the

so called cave-men, and lake-village men, are derived from the East by immigration, some perhaps before and others after the flood. Mr. Rau's book may be commended as giving, in very smooth and courteous style, a very superficial view of the whole case.

Mr. Rau on his closing page states the conclusions for which his reasonings are intended to prepare us:—

> Primitive man sometimes has been described as a pure and happy being, subsisting without exertion on the spontaneous gifts of nature, and enjoying perfect exemption from all those ills which have fallen to the lot of later "degenerate" mortals. Ovid, among other poets of classical antiquity, draws a charming picture of man's state during the infancy of his existence, calling that period the Golden Age of the world. Such conceptions of primeval perfection are certainly very beautiful, but they appear utterly mythical when measured by the standard of modern science. The European of the Drift Age, who fought with the lion and the bear for the possession of a cave, cannot have been a happy and morally perfect being. The extreme rudeness of his mode of life precludes that possibility; a hunter of the lowest grade, he was among men what the carnivorous beast is among animals. We must assign to him the position of a savage, but of a savage as far below the buffalo-hunting Pawnee as the latter is removed from the cultivated representative of the Caucasian race.—P. 162.

Of course Mr. Rau is too polite to shock our superstitious prejudices by saying *Moses* in place of "Ovid," and *garden of Eden* instead of "Golden Age." But as he has furnished no valid disproof of the truth of that tradition of a primitive paradise, asserted by so unanimous a consent of ancient history, we stand with Moses and Ovid.

We give the last sentence of Mr. Rau's book, which we believe to be, like his first sentence, a falsity:—

> "This," says Carl Vogt, "was the paradisean state of primitive man, as narrated to us by those silent witnesses, the stones and bones. From such a low condition has the human species gradually extricated itself, in a bitter struggle for existence, which it was well able to maintain by being gifted with a larger amount of brain and intelligence than that possessed by the surrounding animal world."—P. 162.

To show what kind of an authority Carl Vogt is, that is, what his predispositions on a question so nearly affecting biblical authority are, we give another quotation from him, for which we are indebted to the "British and Foreign Evangelical Review":—

> We know of no creation, either in the beginning or in the course of the world's history, and regard the idea of an extramundane self-conscious Creator as ridiculous. Freewill does not exist, neither does any amenability or responsibility, such as morals and penal justice, and, heaven knows what else, would impose upon us. It is impossible to demonstrate the admissibility of punishment. At no moment are we our own masters, any more than we can regulate the secretions of our kidneys.—P. 306.

Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge. By JAMES THOMSON BIXBY. 12mo., pp. 226. New York: Appleton & Co. 1876.

Mr. Bixby's volume might be divided into three parts. In the first part he discusses the nature of the collision at the present day

between what are supposed to be science and religion. In the second he shows that all the difficulties found in the true religion are found in science. In the third he shows, what he supposes to be, the true genesis and basis of religion in the mind of man, and so authenticates its validity and truth. The work is an interesting and valuable contribution to current thought, but its main value lies in the second of these three parts.

The chief cause of the hostility between science and religion (or, as we should say, between a class of scientists and religion) he believes to be the fact that theology is often confounded with religion. This is a language very current with a certain class of thinkers at the present day. The old encyclopedists of a former century used to say that all religion was the invention of priests. But the most fluent assailants of Christianity in our day profess a belief in religion and repudiation of theology. If, however, you investigate what "religion" it is they accept, you will find that its shape is Proteus and its color is chameleon. Herbert Spencer reveres religion, but holds that it consists in maintaining the reality of his newly-invented fetish, the Unknown Absolute. Any thing that as religion oversteps or varies from the precise acknowledgment of this ghostly and ghastly phantasm is irreligious. Stuart Mill believes that a true religion is perfectly consistent with pure atheism. Mr. Bixby, however, maintains, ably and beautifully, a religion which believes in God, in immortality, and in prayer. He believes that Jesus was the most inspired of all religious teachers. He then has a theology. And in his argument he shows, we think, clearly, however inadvertently, the necessity of a creed, a theology, to a religion. Evidently, though unconsciously, he believes with us, that though theology is not religion, it is the necessary vehicle and form of a religion. Take away all doctrinal truth and no religion is left. He differs from us simply in the number of the articles of his creed.

The religion with which Mr. Bixby proposes to reconcile science is a religion of a very scant pattern. It rejects the Trinity, the incarnation, and all those specific and inspiring truths with which a Wesley or a Moody stirs the hearts and reforms the characters of men. He rejects miracles, and so holds religion within the bounds of lower nature. He hustles the Bible into the same crowd with the Vedas and the Koran. He deals unceremoniously with the Church and all her history. If his were all the religion that can be reconciled with science, his work of mediation we should hold to be of little value. Happily, how-

ever, his argument in the second part as truly authenticates the Trinity with all its results as it does his own slender creed.

In the second part he compares science and religion in respect to their *methods*, their *objects*, and *their degrees of certainty*, and finds that science can in these vital respects claim no exclusive superiority over religion.

1. As to *methods*. It is untruly claimed that science sustains herself in the use of sense-observation, induction, deduction of experimental tests, and verification, while religion deals in intuitions, authority, and analogy. Science plentifully relies upon intuition, and in fact geometry and arithmetic are purely intuitional sciences. We know the existence of an external world only by intuitional faith. Then there are what he does not, but we would, call Primordial Assumptions rather than intuitions, that lie at the basis of all science. Such assumptions, unrecognizable by sense, are the indestructibility of matter, the uniformity of nature, the laws of motion, the persistence of force, and gravitation. These principles cannot be proved; they are not intuitively seen, like a geometrical truth, but they are *assumed by faith*, and must be assumed before we can commence any course of physical reasoning.

2. As to *objects*. It is falsely claimed that science deals with pure mundane and sensible objects, while religion alone mounts into the immaterial, the transcendental, and the infinite. Science dwells amid invisibilities and infinities. No physicist ever saw that parabola which he affirms that a rifle-ball describes; no chemist ever saw oxygen. There are musical notes illimitably above and illimitably below what human ear has ever heard. Who ever saw a molecule, much less an atom? Geometry is familiar with infinities. Does not science deal with those unseen infinities, time and space? Who ever saw gravitation, and who doubts its unlimited extension? What about Force? Who ever saw it? If it be limited to objective matter, how does it pass through pure space? And who can draw a boundary line around its extension? Who has seen, can measure, can reconcile the contrarieties of the luminiferous ether? And we may here add, as Mr. Bixby does not, why should the mind which dwells amid these mysteries and irreconcilabilities launch any sarcasms at the Trinity or the Incarnation? Trained by conceptions like these, science ought readily to accept those divine mysteries, transmitted by the Church of ages, as verified by the sacred records, from the Incarnate himself.

3. As to *certainty*. It is falsely claimed that science is exact, certain, immutable, and religion uncertain and changing. All science is but approximation. The best geometrical figure falsifies its definition and its name. Induction is a process of examining a few specimens and guessing at all the rest. Kepler's laws are not exactly true. The minutest atom indicates complexities that science can only conjecture. There is no perfect time measure; no perfect space measure; no "physical constant" whatever. Nobody knows that the sun will rise to-morrow. And then science is continually false and changing. Where is astrology, alchemy, and the *elixir vitæ?* The rise and fall of so-called sciences are like the rise and fall of empires. The corpses of dead sciences, killed by time and truth, strew the pages of history. The scholar who learned his science fifty years ago must largely unlearn it and learn it anew to-day. While Mr. Bixby's entire book is written with great beauty of style, fertility of illustration, and courtesy of manner, it is these three chapters which we would mainly recommend to our readers. The four closing pages, on the mutabilities of science, are specially suggestive.

And, now, in what divine contrast with these mutabilities of science stands the immutability of the central theology of the Catholic Church of all the Christian ages! From the time of Christ himself down to this hour that theology in its great structural outline has never changed. The dogmas of God, infinite, all-wise, eternal; of the Trinity, three personalities in one essence; of the Incarnation, true God and true man identified in one Christ; of the fall and the redemption; of the forgiveness through faith in Christ; of the immortality of the soul and eternal retribution; all these have stood through more than eighteen centuries unchanged. They will "stand acknowledged while the world shall stand." Temporary and local additions have been often made to them. Special views and theories have often been proposed in regard to them. But bring us to-day the catechism of St. Petersburgh, the decrees of Trent, the articles of England, the platform of Geneva, and the symbols of Augsburgh, and these dogmas are all there. St. Irenæus and John Wesley earnestly alike maintained them. This theology stands "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be." Subordinate differences, leaving free play for human thought, there ever have been. The same article has worn a different phase to different ages and sections of the Church. And the body of Articles is held generically rather than specifically and minutely. Yet in their great generic range they have

ever been the same. The changes demanded by advancing science, be it well noted, are *not changes* IN THEOLOGY, but *changes in special biblical* EXEGESIS. In the latter, changes ever have been frequent. Various interpretations of many parts of the sacred text have left large scope for commentary and discussion. Blundering scientism has often mixed its alloy in with those interpretations and produced blundering exegesis. The false science of the day incorporated with such interpretation induced Lactantius and others to deny that there were antipodes, and later interpreters to deny the motion of the earth. For these errors the scientists are to blame. And Exegesis holds herself free to borrow new light from any quarter, whether from history, psychology, physiology, or any other science. And in all these departments, burdened as the text has been by the errors of science formerly imposed upon it, she sets her interpretations right when science confesses her mistakes and comes right. These were aside errors, having nothing to do with the immutable type of Christian theology. That stands unshaken and indestructible.

And from her high place of calmness this theology can utter free words of cheer to the true scientist, the earnest delver after truth amid the visible works of God. The abused theologian is often himself a pioneer in physical discovery. The biblicist is not compelled to revise his interpretation of the text of the Bible half as often as the scientist is compelled to revise his interpretation of the text of nature. These reinterpretations of nature leave nature unchanged; so do our reinterpretations of the particular text leave our immutable theology untouched.

Comparative Zoology, Structural and Systematic. For use in Schools and Colleges. By JAMES ORTON, A.M., Professor of Natural History in Vassar College; Author of "The Andes and the Amazon." 12mo., pp. 396. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Natural history, as a mass of accumulated facts, commenced with Aristotle under patronage of Alexander the Great. But it was not until the publication, in 1693, of John Ray's "Synopsis" that the facts began to take the form of classification and symmetrical "science." The successive great lights of the science were Linnæus, Buffon, Lamarck, culminating in Cuvier. The principles pervading the great mass of living beings were by Cuvier so traced that the mass assumed the form of a structure. The genius of Darwin has startled the thinking world with the theory, full drawn and ably supported, that the pervading, explaining, and unifying

principle of the whole structure is *genetic*. His followers are beginning to proclaim in confident tones that no systematic zoology can survive which is not based on embryology. The whole world of life, animal and vegetable, is one great indivisible family, of which man is but the most successfully aspiring individual. He is the millionaire, and all the rest are his "poor relations."

Professor Orton's book, however, states the systematic facts, and avoids the advocacy of theories. Wonderful analogies do pervade the ranks of life. Resemblances and gradations characterize the whole structure. Though incapable of being forced into absolute regularity, willful exceptions continually plaguing our clean generalizations, the living world is still a great enjoying and suffering *unit*. St. Paul reveals a glimpse of that *unit* in those words of wonderful pathos, "The *whole* creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." But whether Darwin completes Paul, whether the unity is genetic, Professor Orton declares not.

The philosophers who have denied *life* to the vegetable are clearly contradicted.

At present any boundary of the animal kingdom is arbitrary. "Probably life is essentially the same in the two kingdoms, and to vegetable life faculties are superadded in the lower animals, some of which are here and there not indistinctly foreshadowed in plants." "It must be said that there are organisms which at one period of their life exhibit an aggregate of phenomena such as to justify us in speaking of them as animals, while at another they appear to be as distinctly vegetable."—P. 27.

From the living structureless animal forms he deduces the following inferences as to the relation of life and organization:—

The animal series, therefore, begins with forms that feel without nerves, move without muscles, and digest without a stomach; in other words, life is the cause of organization, not the result of it. Animals do not live because they are organized, but are organized because they are alive.—P. 30.

As to the nature of life we have the following statements:—

In the modern view, life is a system of functions, or the sum total of living phenomena. Many of these phenomena are evidently manifestations of the common force of nature, acting either mechanically, chemically, electrically, or osmotically.

Still the combination of elements into organic cells, the arrangement of these cells into tissues, the grouping of these tissues into organs, and the marshaling of these organs into plans of structure, call for some further shaping, controlling power to effect such wonderful co-ordination. Moreover, the manifestation of feeling and consciousness is a mystery which no physical hypothesis has cleared up. The simplest vital phenomenon has in it something over and above the known forces of the laboratory.—P. 29.

The recent experiments of Robert Hamilton tend to prove the existence in every highly developed organism, of two lives: a life resident in every atom of the structure, however complex, and another life for which we fail to find an expression. But the latter is the life which keeps together the structure as a whole: it is the life that selects the nutrition best suited to its individual self; it is the life that has to do with the continuation of the species; lastly, it is the life to which the

molecular lives, which make up the structure, are subordinated: and when the nameless life departs, those myriad lives, no longer co-operating, start on an independent course.—P. 369.

Professor Orton writes in a clear and attractive style; his pages are richly illustrated with explanatory engravings, and we may cheerfully not only recommend the study of this young science to our "schools and colleges," but we commend his exhibit of the science to the notice of teachers and professors.

Families of Speech. Four Lectures delivered before the Royal Institution of Great Britain in March 1869. By the Rev. FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. 12mo., pp. 137. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1873.

Dr. Farrar is the author of the well known and very valuable Life of Christ, and the present little manual exhibits the same swelling gorgeousness of style as that work. He is also author of the Morrissian Prize Essay on the Atonement, and of a volume of Cambridge University Sermons, the leading sermon of which is on the Fall of Man. Not having seen either of the last-mentioned volumes, we are unaware what are his views of the Atonement and the Fall. The present work is a very interesting, though too magniloquent an introduction to Linguistics. The Lectures imply an unknown but immense antiquity of man. Half a page is made brilliant with a series of sharp pleasantries upon the opponents of Mr. Darwin, although we have found no express declaration of adherence to the derivation theory of species. We should infer, however, that though the author may be orthodox in his theology, he is free in his exegetics, and considers a large share of at least Genesis as nothing above deutero-canonical.

Of "families," he allows but two leading ones—the Aryan and Semitic. Very justly he rejects the name *Turánian* as applicable to a family, since it covers a countless list of families, who are as different in speech from each other as the Aryans were from the Semites. He adopts the more significant term Allophylian, which justly covers all *others* than the two above-named races.

Of the origin of the two great races, the following is the best account he feels competent to give:—

Not far from each other—the one in the regions of Armenia, the other along the great Oxus valley—appeared in the dimmest dawn of commencing human development two races, fairer in complexion, stronger and more beautifully organized in physical constitution, and with spirits incomparably more finely touched to fine issues, than any other races which the world had to that time seen. At periods varying from three thousand to two thousand years before our era a vast division took place in the Aryan race, and whole tribes, destined hereafter to be the fathers of mighty nations, streamed away victoriously in successive waves, first toward the north and west, and later toward the east and south. They became subjected

to different laws, the western tribes advancing farthest in material and intellectual prosperity, the eastern feeding themselves on profounder conceptions in the midst of a remarkable simplicity of life. Meanwhile, at about the same period, the other great race also began to move in immense migrations. In the person of Eber it entered Mesopotamia; in the person of Joktan it entered Arabia; in the person of Abraham it entered Palestine. Indifferent, except in those branches of it which were half Hamitic, to the great arts of war and peace, to this race was it mainly given to keep alive the revelation of the Unity of God and the eternal majesty of the moral law. After a long history, somewhat monotonous, and but rarely triumphant, there arose in the bosom of this race a new and diviner revelation which it rejected, but in the very act of rejecting imparted to the western descendants of its sister race, and then sank gradually, but with one reviving and reactionary effort, into contented subordination. In the hands of this western race the Holy Fire began to burn brighter and yet more bright, and in their great commercial and military progress they reached their long-forgotten and then unrecognized brothers of the east. In the hands of these eastern brothers they saw, as it were, the *crepundia*—the family tokens—which had remained almost intact in their possession, and which once had lain in the common cradle. But before those *crepundia* were recognized there was many a fierce struggle, many a blood-stained battle-field between these brothers, who saw in each other only aliens. After a separation of four thousand years, after having traversed an immense circle of the globe, the younger Aryan returns, not solely to *rule* over the elder, not only to rekindle his torch at the sacred flame which had once glowed on the ancestral hearth, but to teach him—in requital, it may be, for many injuries—the lessons of a superior wisdom, a purer justice, and a loftier morality—above all, to teach him that body of sacred truth, which was long the special glory and amulet of the Hebraic Semite, but which, when once it had been imparted to the Indo-European family, was fostered by Grecian genius, and supported by Roman power, and deepened by Germanic thought, and illustrated by Italian art, and disseminated by the energy and empire of England, and should now be inscribed upon the common laburum, which a race—formed indeed of separate nationalities, but animated by a sublime unanimity of purpose—should regard it as their highest object and their providential mission to render visible and glorious through a redeemed and regenerated world.—Pp. 105, 106.

The epoch of the migration of the Aryans from their common hope he places at A. D. 2000, which is the age of Abraham. Abraham was the eighth from Noah, so that for eight generations the Japhetites remained in their common home in the land of Shinar, or the plateau of Iran.

Of the most ancient and so least developed Allophylian tribes, "which rise like isolated mountain peaks out of broad primeval seas of impenetrable mist," he gives the following description:—

We may say generally that a large number of them belong to the lowest, palæozoic strata of humanity. They were the people whom the Aryan and the Semite overcame in internecine warfare, and oppressed with inextinguishable hate: peoples whom no nation acknowledges as its kinsman; whose language, rich in words for all that can be eaten or handled, seem absolutely incapable of expressing the reflex conceptions of the intellect, or the higher forms of the consciousness: whose life seems confined to a gratification of animal wants, with no hope in the future and no pride in the past. They are for the most part peoples without a literature and without a history, and many of them apparently as imperfectible as the Ainos of Jesso or the Veddahs of Ceylon; peoples whose tongues in some instances have twenty names for murder, but no name for love, no name for gratitude, no name for God. Every civilized nation has found them, and even savage nations have traditions or relics of yet more savage predecessors. The Kelts, the New Zealanders, the North American Indians, all knew or believed that they had

ousted a race of previous inhabitants; and even among the immemorial Chinese there yet linger, in Formosa and Hainan, and among the hills, the relics of an aboriginal population, whom they call by the significant name of Miautsze, *children of the soil.* And indeed these races once covered the soil like the primeval forests, which served by their deciduous leaves to prepare the earth for a later and richer growth. The Egyptians spoke of the Νέκυες, or Dead-ones, who had preceded them; the Canaanites called them Rephaim, a name which the Hebrews adopted as their word for ghosts. In the thirtieth chapter of Job you will find an almost savage description of one such Troglodyte race, and their life described as a dark, solitary, squalid subsistence on roots and mallows in the desolate wilderness, "whose fathers I would have disdained to set with the dogs of my flock, who cut up mallows by the bushes, and juniper roots for their meat. They were driven forth from among men, among the bushes they brayed, under the nettles they were gathered together." . . . The climax of hatred in describing these autochthonal peoples with whom their early poems show that they had a long and terrible struggle, is found in the language of the Aryans of Hindostan. Among them the Aborigines whom they dispossessed are called Locust-eaters, Hill-dwellers, Raw-eaters, Rejectors of Indra, Monkey-tribes, Snakes, black, noseless, faceless demons, of squat stature and inarticulate speech. In the Hindoo theatricals to this day Mr. Hunter informs us that they are introduced on the stage as the demon inhabitants of the lower regions, with human faces but serpent tails, and sometimes with broad hoods, which represent the expanded neck of the cobra *de capello.*—Pp. 115–117.

The volume presents several ethnographical charts and maps, which are a great convenience to the reader.

The Life and Growth of Language. An Outline of Linguistic Science. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanscrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College. International Scientific Series. 12mo., pp. 319. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1876.

The young student and popular reader interested in linguistics are obliged to Professor Whitney for this handy summary and compact posting-up in that science. For simplicity and clear concisеness of style it stands in favorable contrast with Dr. Farrar's over-eloquent book. Though a specialist in this department, the professor speaks with the modesty of true science. He is careful to caution his readers from expecting too much. He warns us that the science is very unfinished, and even when finished will not answer all questions, nor rule over all other departments of thought. Thus upon the attempt of Bunsen and others to settle the chronology of our race by philology we have the following statement: "As for the time, [when the Aryan race was undispersed,] the less said about that the better, in this transitional period of opinion as to the age of man on the earth. The question whether the first man was born only 6,000 years ago, or 12,000, or 100,000, or 1,000,000, as the new schools of anthropology are beginning to claim, is one of which the decision must exercise a controlling influence on that which we have here in view. As for the testimony of language itself, there is none, of any authority; the philologists will doubtless claim that they do

not see how to compress the growth of Indo-European language into the shortest of the periods named, but they have not yet found a rule with which to measure the time they actually need. To give even a conjecture at present would be foolish."—P. 192.

Equally negative is the professor as to the finding in philology any due proof of the original unity of language. With perfect propriety he does not look to Genesis for any guidance on this question; with propriety, we say, because it is a matter of great interest to know what result investigation can throw up irrespective of Genesis. Yet as to the question of a discoverable primitive of language Genesis is indifferent. When we take up Genesis, the narrative of Babel (confirmed as it is by Assyrian discoveries) must be held as historical. And being held as historical, no interpretation can decide by it whether the primitive is still existing or whether it is obliterated. Either supposition is allowed by the text, so that Genesis is unimpeached by either supposition.

The most interesting word, etymologically, in our language, as we think, is *alphabet*. The tyro in Greek knows that it is identical with the first two letters of the Greek alphabet, *alpha* and *beta*. If he be also a tyro in Hebrew, he also knows that the two Greek letters are identical with the first two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, *aleph* and *beth*, which signify *ox* and *house;* the objects of which the letters are an abridged picture. And so the next two Greek letters in row, *delta* and *gamma*, are the Hebrew *daleth* and *gimel*, that is, *door* and *camel*. And the Greeks confessed that they derived their letters from Cadmus, that is, *the East*. They also said that the alphabet was Phenician—that is, Hebrew; for the Phenician language was Hebrew. The tyro also perceives that each name of a letter begins with that letter in its spelling. Daleth is the first letter of the word *door*. And so through the alphabet, each visible letter is an abbreviated picture of an object of whose name that letter is the initial element. And if the tyro has a smatter of hieroglyphic lore he knows that such is also the Egyptian method. The hieroglyphic is a brief picture of an object beginning with it. So that the Hebrew alphabet is the appropriation of the Egyptian method to the Hebrew language by some Egyptian-Hebrew man. Moreover, linguists remark that the objects of the Hebrew alphabet are selected from pastoral and not from city life. Gesenius also says that they are in strictly Hebrew rather than Syriac words. What Egyptian-Hebrew shepherd, now, do we know in history who lived at the right age to be the author of this invention? The answer is Moses in the land of Midian.

And it is a remarkable coincidence that the earliest mentioned act of writing mentioned in history was performed by Moses. All this does not prove that Moses was the "Cadmus" who invented letters, but it does show that in him all the points meet necessary for such an invention more than in any other known character in history.

The Modern Genesis; being an Inquiry into the Nebular Theory of the Origin of Planetary Bodies, the Structure of the Solar System, and of General Cosmical History. By Rev. W. B. SLAUGHTER. Small 12mo., pp. 298. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1876.

A *nebula* is a mist or fog. The nebular theorist maintains that the original state of the entire system of worlds was that of a very thin fog extending through the entire space occupied by the present stellar system. So very thin, indeed, was this vast fog, that it would take several cubical miles of its separate particles to weigh a grain. But either by diminution of the heat separating these particles, or by natural attraction, this fog would form into an immense ball, and this ball would not only continually condense and become smaller and more compact, but would begin to whirl itself around. It would go on whirling itself around faster and faster until it would finally whirl around so fast as to fling a circular rim from off its edge. This circular rim would also whirl round on itself and become a smaller ball, and also whirl around the big ball evermore. Then the big ball would keep whirling, and whirl off another rim, which would become in like manner a doubly whirling ball to the end of the chapter. And that was the way the worlds were made.

Biblicists have generally made little objection to this theory, quietly waiting until it was proved. Indeed, immediately after its general propagation it was taken by some as a solution of the difficulties of the Mosaic "genesis." Perhaps the most ingenuous of all such solutions is furnished by Professor Guyot of Princeton, based on this theory, as will be found in the proceedings of the late Evangelical Alliance. But the accredited author of the theory, La Place, held it to be so clearly atheistic that he told Napoleon, "I have no need of the hypothesis of a God." Herbert Spencer makes it the premise of his evolutionism, and Büchner jubilates over it as modern science playing into the hands of atheism.

In spite of the disqualifying "Rev." prefixed to his name, Mr. Slaughter excludes all biblical reference, and meets the issue on scientific grounds. Truth is truth, in science as elsewhere, even

though uttered by a clergyman. And in this theory he meets a difficulty at every step. He does not, indeed, stop to ask how this *nebula* came to be there as primitive raw material for the future worlds; but admitting that the fog would form into a ball, he denies that there is any thing to set it whirling. All the condensation would tend to the center, forever forming a colder, solider, and smaller ball, lying entirely still. Next, if it did whirl, could it ever whirl so fast as to whirl off a rim? And if it did whirl off a part of itself, why should it stop until it whirled off the whole of itself? And, then, if a ball could thus fling off a part of itself, the part would fly in direction from the equator of said ball, and so all the planets ought to be in the plane of the equator, which they are not. And so in regard to velocity of the planets, their densities, etc., Mr. S. maintains that the planets contradict the demands of the theory. If so, we think the planets are correct. We go with the planets.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Florida: Its Scenery, Climate, and History. With an Account of Charleston, Savannah, Augusta, and Aiken; a Chapter for Consumptives; various Papers on Fruit-culture; and a complete Hand-book and Guide. By SIDNEY LANIER. With numerous illustrations. 12mo., pp. 336. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1876.

In spite of a considerable amount of forced rhetoric, Sidney Lanier, the author of the Centennial Cantata so much criticised, has furnished us a very readable and reliable presentation of Florida. Without over-coloring, save in occasional strains which the ordinary reader can easily discriminate as poor poetry interspersed through pages of passable prose, we have geographical descriptions, statistical masses of facts, sanitary counsels, agricultural and pomological dissertations, and accurate pictorial engravings, furnishing for the pleasure tourist, the refugee from the northern winter, the invalid in search of a sanitary clime, and the immigrant prospecting for a home and a competence, the information he needs. A little experience of some of the regions he describes enables us to say with assurance that whenever Mr. Lanier writes level prose he writes probable truth.

As the night of slavery and the clouds of civil war clear up, Florida, with all her drawbacks, appears to view, a revelation and an inestimable acquisition. Her drawbacks are patent to the eye. She is a gift of the sea; a long marine sandback, projected many miles into the semi-tropical regions, lined by the Atlantic on one

side and creating the Gulf on the other. She has been over and over again swept and razeed by wars; wars between races, religions, and nationalities, lasting for three centuries, down to the Seminole War, which almost extinguished civilization, and, finally, down to our civil war, of which the scars are still fresh. Hence her aspect in prominent localities is utterly forlorn, suggesting decay and barrenness. And the eye that selects and combines these aspects into a general picture will report to you that Florida is an imposture. But there are other points of consideration that reveal her as a boon and a blessing.

It is within the last three years that Florida has awakened to an opening view of her capabilities, and of the true direction her energies should take. Deprived by the war and the abolition of slavery of her cotton culture, her people were as ignorant as lost children by what means to secure a living. Northern enterprise has at length come to point the way. The "Florida Agriculturist" was started, and placed under the admirable editorship of Mr Codrington, a Yankee by birth and a West Indian by education, who unites in its columns the New England acuteness with an ample knowledge of semi-tropical agriculture, and thereby makes it a noble educator of Floridian enterprise. A State Fruit Growers' Association was formed under admirable management, and conventions were by it held where every man contributed his stock of knowledge of the possible productions of the State and the best methods of cultivation. It is a significant proof of the great freedom of the State from belligerent or sectional bitterness that Mr. P. P. Bishop, an eminent Baptist minister from Auburn, N. Y., was spontaneously chosen president of this association. Indeed, Northmen and Southrons, Federals and Confederates, here mix together in a thoughtless and jovial way, utterly oblivious of any past "unpleasantness," or of differences of birth-place. The most enthusiastic Floridians are often the Northerners. The result is unity of effort, the rising of a buoyant hope of a prosperous future, the formation and commencement of plans of vegetable and fruit culture, and the arrangement of cheap transportation by which Florida shall deposit the earliest products of her year in the markets of New York, Boston, and Chicago. It would doubtless grieve the very central heart of our friend, Dr. Bledsoe, of the "Southern Review," to see how all his theories of "the benign doctrine of secession," and of the eternal opposition between our northern and southern polarities, are vanishing away from the minds of these unappreciative people, to be

succeeded by golden visions of orange groves and measureless fields of sugar-cane pouring untold wealth into their pockets.

Mr. Lanier's "various Papers on Fruit-culture" are extracted, with honest credit given, from papers read before the Association. The principal products discussed are the orange, the grape, and the sugar-cane.

The word "orange" is just now the sweetest sound in the language to a Floridian's ear. He has just discovered that *his* orange is the sweetest and juiciest in the world, able to drive every rival from the market. The principal paper on this fruit, read by Mr. A. J. Harris, of Ocala, reports that it takes eight or ten years to produce the first orange from the seedling, and from five to seven years more to attain a full remunerative crop. We suppose that means that if you plant a grove to-day you may find it pay splendidly fifteen or seventeen years hence. But there are scattered through the State patches of wild trees which may be budded with the sweet orange and save a few years. But orange-planting is work for only the young men, or for old men who care for posterity. And the means of living must be meanwhile obtained from other sources. But one of the most eminent orangeists of Florida, Prof. J. H. Fowler, in a public lecture, estimates a good orange-tree in full bearing as worth from ten to a hundred dollars annual value. "A thousand mature trees are a competence for any man." Col. Hart, of Pilatka, reports that from a single tree he gathered forty-five hundred oranges, netting him about a hundred and fifty dollars. Undoubtedly a thousand such trees would be a fortune. Mr. Harris reports a tree in Marion County bearing ten thousand five hundred oranges in a single season. The main orange belt is between the twenty-eighth and thirtieth degrees of latitude. There is romance in the vision of this belt laid out in groves. No culture is so Oriental, so ideal, so aristocratic, as that of this wonderfully beautiful fruit. What a lucky man, twenty years hence, will be the Floridian Prince of Orange!

And Florida is the true land of the sugar-cane. Nearly the entire State lies farther south than the southern boundary of Louisiana, and by that much is better cane land. The cane seldom or ever tassels in Louisiana, but tassels in Northern Florida. And the farther south you go the taller is the stalk. In northern Florida it averages five feet in height; in middle Florida seven feet; in Southern Florida from nine to twelve feet. Senator Yulee carried to Washington a cane of seventeen feet; and

the shore of Lake Worth produced a cane of twenty-two feet. You plant it like corn, but it does not require, like corn, an annual planting. It *rattoons*, that is, reproduces from its root fresh stalks, for two or three years in northern Florida, and seven or eight years in the Southern. The annual profits are cited at three or four hundred dollars to the acre.

Mr. Albert J. Bidwell of Arlington, while waiting for the maturity of his orange grove, gets livelihood from flower and grape culture. His floral display vindicates Florida's claim as potentially "the land of flowers." He supplies for northern florists many a specimen that cannot be easily obtained this side Italy. As pioneer in grape culture he reports that there is a large variety of grapes easily to be raised in Florida, and, what is very important, two months earlier ready for market than any other grape. He expects to realize from twenty to forty cents per pound, while the Northern grape-grower gets but ten. And what is true of the grape is true of every variety of table vegetables. The sole condition for successful culture, cheap and sure transportation, is being rapidly established; and vast areas of Northern Florida are prospectively coming under culture for supplies. Florida is to be our winter garden.

And space fails us to tell of the banana, the fig, the olive, the cocoanut, and thirty or forty more semi-tropicals, rare and curious, which Mr. Codrington enumerates, as hitherto unknown to our people, but lying in our near future. In all these we reverently believe as we are told, and will still more firmly believe when we see them.

But to the invalid and the sexagenarian, upon whom the northern winter lays a relentless strain, Florida is a new resource. Most persons, as age begins to chill the blood, need the mercies of a milder climate. Professor Moses Stuart, when age in years had scarce commenced, in the severe winters of Massachusetts, was obliged to cry, "I shiver in these winds; I have lost all resisting power." Florida was not then invented, or she might have added decades of vigor and usefulness to his life. Alternating between the banks of the St. Johns and the sea-shores of Maine, Professor Stowe is able to expel both winter and summer from his year, and live in almost a perpetual June. And of this continuous semi-tropical life, north and south, the most sanitary point is that it is a *life in perpetual open air*. The system is vitalized by an ever-fresh current of oxygen. Florida is always being swept by the exchanging breezes between the Atlantic and the Gulf. And even

in her summer, which is her rainy season, the air is daily freshened by the showers soon absorbed by her sandy soil.

Aristophanes' Apology. By ROBERT BROWNING. Pp. 324. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co.

This is another of those mysteries that allure the student, but do not come within the range of the common reader. If ever poet was caviare to the multitude, Browning is he. Wordsworth had points many in common with the masses. Shakspeare had, and Milton. Browning delights to vail himself in a cloud, and to occasionally flash his inner glory through rifts in the darkness. Yet his purpose is not to be cloudy. No poet ever took more common themes, sometimes too common. "Fifine at the Fair" is the story of a ballet girl: "Red Cotton Night cap Country," of a *blase roué* and his mistress playing wanton and *religieuse*. Yet each is full of sharpest lines and thoughts. Some of his poems are the grandest in modern language. "Rabbi Ben Ezra" has no equal as a poem of human life. "Death in the Desert" is the grandest defense of Christ and Revelation against modern skeptics in verse or prose. It is the dying talk of the Apostle John concerning Christ. Especially does he favor classic themes. This is one of them. Euripides is dead. Balaustion, a worshiper of his, possesses one of his tragedies. Aristophanes and she get into a discussion as to the comparative merits of comedy and tragedy, in which much sparkling thought is evolved; and she finally reads Euripides' drama of "Hercules," as a proof of his superiority. How if she had read Aristophanes' "Clouds?" Had Browning translated that he would have come nearer his genius. At least he could have given both. The grossness of passages could have been omitted, and the rushing, raging power of his choruses been splendidly given.

Anywhere you open these pages you see rifts and flashes amid clouds and darkness. How beautiful, on the first page, this farewell to Athens by Balaustion:—

> "Athenai, live thou hearted in my heart:
> Never again may these repugnant orbs
> Ache themselves blind before the hideous pomp,
> The ghastly mirth which mocked thine overthrow.
> Fire should have flung a passion of embrace
> About thee till, resplendently inarmed,
> (Temple by temple folded to his breast,
> All thy white wonder fainting out in ash)
> Some vaporous sigh of soul had lightly 'scaped,
> And so the Immortals bade Athenai back!"

How magnificent the description of the sea :—

"What if thy watery plural vastitude,
Rolling unanimous advance, had rushed,
Might upon might, a moment,—stood, one stare,
Sea-face to city-face, thy glaucous wave,
Glassing that marbled last magnificence,—
Till fates' pale tremulous foam-flower tipped the gray,
And when wave broke and overswarmed and sucked
To bounds back, multitudinously ceased,
And land again breathed unconfused with sea,
Attiké was, Athenai was not now!"

So every page. Thus the next :—

"Why should despair be? Since, distinct above
Man's wickedness and folly, flies the wind
And floats the cloud, free transport for our soul
Out of its fleshly durance dim and low,—
Since disembodied soul anticipates
(Thought-borne as now, in rapturous unrestraint)
Above all crowding, crystal silentness,
Above all noise, a silver solitude.
O nothing doubt, Philemon! Greed and strife,
Hatred and cark and care, what place have they
In yon blue liberality of heaven?"

The brilliant defense of Aristophanes, as a satirist and critic needful to his age and all ages, is as luxuriously wanton in fullness of expression and imagery as a tropical wilderness :—

"I dose each culprit just with—Comedy.
Let each be doctored in exact the mode
Himself prescribes: by words, the word-monger—
My words to his words,—my lies, if you like,
To his lies.
Every word is false,
Looked close at; but stand distant and stare through,
All's absolute indubitable truth.
Behind lies, truth which only lies declare."

And thus, ever metaphysical, ever abounding in quip and turn, and turns and fancy ever possessed by a deep, calm, strong soul, this seer and sayer sings his song. If any Greekist wants to know the fullness of that tongue, let him read Browning. If any one would see a translation which is not as dead as a dead language, like Cowper, and Bryant, and Derby, and is as musical and full of life and finish as the grand original, let him read "Herakles," in this volume. Milton never equaled these choruses in

music and flow. Their intervoluted fullness just suits Browning's nature. How neatly this opens:—

> "Even a dirge, can Phoibus suit
> In song to music jubilant
> For all its sorrow: making shoot
> His golden plectron o'er the lute,
> Melodious ministrant."

And this speaks to every parent's heart:—

> "Don't fear I shirk
> My children's service! this way, men are men,
> No difference! best and worst, they love their boys
> After one fashion: wealth they differ in—
> Some have it, others not; but each and all
> Combine to form the children-loving race."

Whoever wishes to study poetry should read Browning; whoever prefers mere sentiment, tagged with rhymes, or strung on rhymes, must needs seek elsewhere. H.

Life and Letters of the Rev. John M'Clintock, D.D., LL.D., late President of Drew Seminary. By GEORGE R. CROOKS, D.D. Large 12mo, pp. 410. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1876.

The life of M'Clintock by Dr. Crooks will be a classic in our biographical literature. It is a labor of love, a tribute of reverence to a noble character. The task was, no doubt, easy, from the freshness of the writer's recollections, from the contributions of M'Clintock's friends, such as Longacre, Biglow, and Mrs. Robinson, and from his habits of copious journalizing and epistolizing. His years of early education, his professional career, his editorial period, his metropolitan pulpit performances, his foreign residence, and his presidency at Drew, are all fresh and vivid in many a living memory.

Dr. Crooks touches with a delicate pen the differences of view on the slavery question, and this is no place for us to state any issue. Dr. M'Clintock's disengagement from the "Quarterly Review" was an advantage to him, as it impelled him into a broader and higher field of action. However his position on the slavery question lost him the sympathy of our advancing Church, it secured him the powerful support of our metropolitan laity, who were zealous to heap honors on one who carried his honors so gracefully. Then followed his transatlantic residence, which was the most brilliant period of his life, in which he unfolded as a preacher, a patriot, and an antislavery leader, in a manner well deserv-

ing of the ovation which our New Yorkers offered him on his return.

Dr. M'Clintock's natural advantages were great. His was a most manly person; a high-toned bearing, suggesting the ecclesiastical dignitary; a mellifluous voice and natural enunciation, rendering it a pleasure to hear any words from him whatever; and a taking magnetism, that won even those who were firmly his opponents. He was, as has been said, "many-sided," and but for the disease and debility that flung their Promethean fetter upon him through his whole life, he would have unfolded from every one of his many sides an activity which would have made him great in manifold directions. But it was his to bear, with what resigned serenity he could, the tantalizing consciousness of great capacities hemmed in and made abortive by one stern incapacity. This touching fact, together with the early close of his career, sheds, in spite of his buoyant spirit and the cheerful tone of his biographer, an air of sadness over the narrative. As worthless as the coldest pessimism represents it would be this our suffering life, were it not that there is revealed a nobleness even in suffering and sorrow which nothing but suffering and sorrow could reveal. And there is a wisdom demonstrating itself to be divine in the fact that the great Representative of our race summed up our sorrows in Himself. Who but the greatest and most divine of sufferers should be our symbol?

Educational.

Athenagoras. Edited for Schools and Colleges. By F. A. MARCH, LL.D. With Explanatory Notes, by W. B. OWEN, Adjunct Professor of Christian Greek in La Fayette College. 12mo., pp. 262. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

This is third in a series of Christian classics in Greek and Latin, founded in an endowment for that purpose by Mr. Benjamin Douglas. It was preceded by a volume of Latin Hymns, and Selections from Eusebius, (already slightly noticed in our Quarterly.) Tertullian, Justin Martyr, and Augustine are to follow, and still others in series. Whether adopted in College classes or not, we think there are hundreds of scholars who will welcome these specimen Christian classics; and all the more for the Notes and other appended aids. Professor Packard of Yale speaks, in a late "New Englander," in opposition to their introduction into colleges. He believes that the Pagan classics by introducing us to a more widely different world from the present, yet not too foreign, is a great enlargement to the mind, truly demanded in our course of educa-

tion. There are philosophy and force in the reasoning. And yet the Christian world in the Pagan world of the Antonines is a world about as diverse from ours as the Pagan world of Augustus. In a true judgment, divested of prejudice, we think there is no Pagan author who handled the Latin language with such force and fire as Tertullian; there is no writer among the Pagan classics of so marked a character; and his age and position in his age constitute a *new diversity* that might well be added to the educational course.

Athenagoras is alone among the earliest Fathers in the classic purity of his Greek. In reading Clement, Justin, and the others, we find a Hebraism that must have sounded oddly to the Attic Greek. But we have wondered with what sensations Plato would have read Athenagoras. He is with great propriety selected in the course; and the editing and notes are what the student could wish. We welcome this series and wish it complete success.

Three classes of thinkers have found an interest in depreciating the Fathers. The first are the Calvinists, who find the Fathers condemning predestination and necessitated will as stringently as the modern Arminians and with the self-same arguments. The second are the anti-episcopals, who untruly imagine that the Fathers sustain prelacy. Undoubtedly they do prove that episcopacy, in more or fewer Churches, did originate in the apostolic age, but they do not prove its obligatory character, its necessity to the validity of a Church, or its strict universality at the beginning. The third class is the skeptics, who impugn the Fathers to destroy the authority of the New Testament books. And they find the "evangelical" writers playing into their hands beautifully. The first infidel book we remember to have read was by Abner Kneeland. And his main instrument for knocking the props from under the New Testament was Daillé on the "Right Use of the Fathers." He was able to prove by that work that the said Fathers were few and scanty, weakheaded, mendacious, contradictory, and largely spurious.

The most curious fact is that this very "evangelical" class, after having demolished and abolished the Fathers, are ready to turn around and quote these very Fathers, for their own purposes, as high authorities. When it is necessary to sustain infant baptism, or immersion, or the Sunday sabbath, or the canon of the New Testament, these same Fathers, who have so lately been sent to the penitentiary for perjury, are dressed up and brought into court as valid witnesses. And how appalling are the conse-

quences of this antipatristical rant! Were, indeed, the early faithful Church—the Church of the Catacombs and the martyrdoms—fools, liars, and heretics? Were the leaders who defended the Church against paganism, who kept the canon inviolate, who maintained the apostolic tradition pure and incorrupt against the terrible deluge of Gnosticism, and who gave us the Apostles' Creed, no authorities? Has there never been a Christian literature before the Reformation? Is Christianity, then, a failure? Now for one condemnable thing in the apostolic Fathers we will find a dozen condemnable things in Luther, Calvin, and the other reformers. We would far rather take the apostolic age as the guide of our faith than the Reformation age. Though no way a co-ordinate authority with the canon, the early writers are the best aids in accepting and interpreting the canon that the past centuries afford.

Homeric Synchronism. An Inquiry into the Time and Place of Homer. By Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., Author of "Juventus Mundi." Pp. 284. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

The eminent statesman has invented a new science and called it "Homerology." His enthusiasm for those most wonderful products of the human mind, the Homeric poems, attracted first by their esthetic splendor, employs itself in minute analysis of their linguistic qualities, and in the indications of the land and age in which the poet lived. Mr. Gladstone, with no little reason, accepts the Troy that Schliemann has exhumed. He peremptorily denies that Homer belongs to the Greek-Asiatic islands or mainland. He was an Achaian of European Greece. The late discoveries in Egyptology render possible a knowledge of Homer's relations to Egypt; and as we have some clear *data* of Egyptian chronology, we ascertain approximately the age of Homer's existence. The result places his age slightly earlier than the ordinary chronology. It is refreshing to see the noble ex-premier luxuriating in studies at once so elegant and erudite, exhibiting an example so few are competent to follow.

Miscellaneous.

Memoir of Norman M'Leod. D.D. By his Brother, the Rev. DONALD M'LEOD, B.A. Two volumes. 8vo., pp. 360. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1876.

The grand figure of Norman M'Leod is admirably represented in these magnificent volumes. His singular combination in harmony of what are often supposed to be incompatible traits renders his life a study and a lesson.

Laws Relating to Religious Corporations. A Compilation of the Statutes of the Several States in the United States in Relation to the Incorporation and Maintenance of Religious Societies, and to the Disturbance of Religious Meetings. By Rev. SANFORD HUNT, D.D. With an Address on Laws Affecting Religious Corporations in the State of New York. By Hon. E. L. FANCHER, LL.D. 12mo., pp. 273. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1876.

Every pastor needs a law-book. So varying are the laws of the different States that our itinerancy, that knows no limits, needs a knowledge of the laws of each. His work has been carefully compiled and duly sanctioned by high legal authority. It is the minister's lawyer.

Christian Baptism: its Subjects and Mode. By S. M. MERRILL, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 12mo., pp. 311. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1876.

Bishop Merrill has here furnished a popular, brief, and inexpensive work to meet the wants of the ordinary inquirer. As such the style is lucid, and the argument logically stated. Pastors will find it a handy manual for practical use.

History of the Wesley M. E. Church of Brooklyn, L. I. By GILBERT E. CURRIE. 12mo., pp. 315. New York: N. Tibbals & Son.

Rightly claims to be a "pioneer" book. It is the history of the founding and progress of a single Church, in which events and personages of a magnitude proportioned to the history may find themselves duly immortalized.

Is "Eternal" Punishment Endless. By an Orthodox Minister of the Gospel. 16mo., pp. 102. Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, & Co. 1876.

Written in behalf of that class of thinkers who sympathize with the evangelical Church, but doubt the doctrine of eternal conscious misery. It takes ground in behalf of "nescience." Future punishment is revealed; but no unequivocal revelation is made of its precise nature or duration.

The Age of Elizabeth. By MANDELL CREIGHTON, M.A., Late Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. With Maps and Tables. 16mo., pp. 244. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

This is an admirable series of historical works, small in form, yet written with full erudition by eminent masters of the field from a modern stand-point. They are a lot of history in a nutshell.

History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER. In two volumes. 12mo., pp. 434 and 435. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

This work we noticed and disapproved at its first publication, and do not find it at all improved in the present edition.

The Church Record. 8vo., pp. 165. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

An improved edition of a work which every pastor needs.

Barnes's Notes on James, Peter, John, and Jude. Revised edition. 12mo., pp. 400. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1875.

The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version, (A.D. 1611.) With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation. By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. VI. Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets. 8vo., pp. 750. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1876.

Exodus; or, The Second Book of Moses. By JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn. Translated by Charles M. Mead, Ph. D., Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature at Andover. 8vo., pp. 206. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

The Gospel and Epistles of John. With Notes Critical, Explanatory, and Practical Designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. HENRY COWLES, D.D. 12mo., pp. 390. New York: Appleton & Co.

The Believer's Victory Over Satan's Devices. By Rev. W. L. PARSONS, D.D. 16mo., pp. 310. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

Open Letters to Primary Teachers. By Mrs. W. F. CRAFTS. 12mo., pp. 204. New York: Nelson & Phillips.

Spiritualism on Trial. Containing the Arguments of Rev. F. W. Evans in the Debate on Spiritualism between him and Mr. A. J. Fishback. 12mo., pp. 432. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

Select Poems of Thomas Gray. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. 12mo., pp. 143. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Stray Studies from England and Italy. By JOHN RICHARD GREEN. 12mo., pp. 361. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Words: their Use and Abuse. By WILLIAM MATTHEWS, LL.D. 12mo., pp. 384. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1876.

Principia; or, Basis of Social Science. By R. J. WRIGHT. 8vo., pp. 524. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1876.

Harper's School Geography. Richly Illustrated. 4to., pp. 124. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Benjamin Franklin. A Picture of the Struggles of our Infant Nation One Hundred Years Ago. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 336. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1876.

Familiar Talks to Boys. By Rev. JOHN HALL, D.D. 12mo., pp. 98. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co.

On Fermentation. By P. SCHUTZENBERGER, Director at the Chemical Laboratory at the Sorbonne. Twenty-eight Illustrations. The International Scientific Series. 12mo., pp. 331. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1876.

The Fall of the Stuarts and Western Europe from 1678 *to* 1697. By Rev. E. HALE, M.A., Assistant Master at Eton. With Maps and Plans. 16mo., pp. 247. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

The Greeks and the Persians. By Rev. GEORGE W. COX, M.A. 16mo., pp. 215. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

The Crusades. By GEORGE W. COX, M.A. With a Map. 16mo., pp. 225. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

Free, Yet Forging their own Chains. By C. M. CORNWALL. 12mo., pp. 575. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1876.

Lena; or, The Stark Family. A Sketch of Real Life. From the Swedish of H. Hofsten. By CARL LARSEN. 12mo., pp. 250. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1876.

The French at Home. By ALBERT RHODES. With numerous Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 256.

The Crew of the Dolphin. By HESBA STRETTON. 16mo., pp. 232. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co.

Methodist Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, 1876.

Art. I.—RECENT ORIGIN OF MAN.

[FIRST ARTICLE.]

The Recent Origin of Man, as Illustrated by Geology and the Modern Science of Prehistoric Archæology. By James C. Southall. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1875.

This work presents the most complete statement yet made in one volume of the facts bearing on human antiquity. Though the author is comparatively unknown to science, and lays little claim to discoveries made by himself, he has, with great industry and honesty, collated about all the known facts on this subject, and condensed them into one thick volume. Besides his industry, he brings to the work a clear style, a keen, analytic mind, and a thorough honesty of purpose. In consequence of these qualities, the treatise far exceeds in value to the general student the better known, but older and less complete, works of Sir Charles Lyell and Sir John Lubbock.

When a new field of discovery is opened up, its explorers are often betrayed by their enthusiasm into many crude inferences. If at the same time they happen to be swayed by a strong prejudice, they seem to know no limits to their extravagance. This is precisely the situation of many writers on "prehistoric man." Excusably enthusiastic over their interesting discoveries, many of them have superadded a strong desire to make their facts tell against evangelical Christianity. It is not fashionable for them to avow this in set words, but they manifest their anxiety for it, and the consciousness that their readers expect it, in a thousand ways. They have strained

their facts in the most unnatural ways for proofs of an enormous human antiquity. Determined on their end, of exceeding the traditional six thousand years, they make no account of discrepancies among themselves, and have contradicted each other to the extent of millions of years. When investigators thus lose their balance of judgment, and rush, like a flock of sheep, after a predetermined conclusion, they are sure to commit enormous blunders.

In the present discussion they have misunderstood the facts, and erred in stating them; and from data thus warped have drawn conclusions so loose and inconsequent as to excite the amazement of candid investigators. This may seem like harsh language; but the writer of this review, in examining the localities and following up the tracks of the anthropologists, has found so much that is false in fact, and fallacious in reasoning, that he is impelled, in the interest of science, to solemnly protest against such loose and unscientific methods.

In the midst of all this willful confusion Mr. Southall comes forward with the book under review, and, going with a clear analysis through the whole mass of real and false discovery, endeavors to separate the proved from the unproved, and to reduce the chaos to order.

The facts bearing on this subject are derived from the following sources: 1. Megalithic monuments and tumuli. 2. The relics of pile dwellings in certain lakes. 3. The shell mounds. 4. The peat bogs. 5. The bone caverns. 6. The river "Drift" of England and France. 7. Miscellaneous localities. From these sources a vast number of relics of ancient man have been exhumed, such as knives, arrowheads, spear-heads, hatchets, needles, swords, spurs, helmets, shields, pottery, woolen and leather clothing; articles of food, like barley, dried fruit, burnt bread; also coins, jewels, medals, and other objects too numerous to mention. The materials of them are flint, and almost every other kind of stone, wood, bone, ivory, leather, wool, flax, bronze, iron, lead, gold, silver, etc.

The examination of them has led to the belief that in Western Europe there was a time when the ancient savages were unacquainted with metals, and never polished their flint implements, but shaped them exclusively by chipping. This is termed the Palæolithic Age, and is set apparently at any

vague period in the past which suits the fancy of writers. Some of them talk of millions of years.

At a time believed to be later the savages are supposed to have been still unacquainted with metals, and still to have used chipped flints; but they chipped with a nicer skill, and occasionally went to the prodigious labor of polishing flint axes by rubbing them for many a weary day on slabs of sandstone. This is called the Neolithic Age, or sometimes the Polished Stone Age. This is vaguely set by some at about ten thousand years ago.

In the next period the natives had acquired the knowledge of copper and tin, but not of iron. They still used flint, but supplemented it with bronze, an alloy of copper and tin, which is capable of being tempered almost like steel.

Finally, some time after the siege of Troy, and before the Christian era, the age of iron came in, when steel, by its superior excellence and cheapness, drove bronze implements mostly out of use.

As applied to actual discoveries, Mr. Southall believes that this distinction of ages is largely imaginary. He does not deny that there was a time when the early men of Europe had little or no metal, nor that there was a period when bronze was frequently used, and iron absent or scarce; but he believes that a clear distinction of ages can only be believed in by one who resolutely shuts his eyes to the fact that flint implements continued to be used down to a few centuries ago along with bronze and iron, and that innumerable articles of metal, and even coins of the Roman emperors, have been found in localities assigned to the Stone Age.

Megalithic Monuments and Tumuli.

Commencing with the megalithic monuments and *tumuli*, he proceeds to examine the recorded facts. The *tumuli* are closely connected with the great stone monuments, and evidently in many cases were built by the same people. This is shown both by the character of the remains, and by the fact that the two kinds of works are often combined, there being many megalithic tombs with the earth heaped in *tumuli* over them.

The megalithic monuments and *tumuli* are widely spread, existing all over Western Europe, in Northern Africa, in Pal-

estine, in Arabia, in the Black Sea regions, in Tartary, in India, in Australia, and in North and South America. The labor involved in constructing such groups as are found at Stonehenge and Avebury, in England, was immense. Avebury consisted, first, of a circular wall of earth nearly three quarters of a mile in circumference, and inclosing in its interior a broad, moat-like ditch. Around the edge of the circular plateau inclosed by the ditch stood about one hundred huge stones, each fifteen to eighteen feet high and thirteen feet thick. Within this circle of stones stood two other circles of less dimensions. From the outer inclosing wall a grand avenue of stones ran perfectly straight for nearly a mile. Advocates of human antiquity have assigned this great work to the Neolithic Age, that is, to one of the periods when metals were unknown, and implements were made of stone. Now an antiquarian of two hundred years ago records that a "square bit of iron" was found under one of the stones in pulling it down, and Roman coins were found in and about the circle; while in an adjacent *tumulus*, which is a part of the general system of the works, an iron bridle-bit and fragments of armor were exhumed. The antiquarian, Mr. Ferguson, thinks that Avebury commemorates the battle of Badon Hill, fought A. D. 520.

Stonehenge is a smaller circle, but more artistic in structure. Its upright stones were connected by cap-stones, extending from one upright to another. The blocks prove the existence of metals by the fact that, though very hard, they are hewn into mortices and tenons, for retaining the cap-stones in position. Now against the supposition of a very enormous antiquity for Stonehenge must be placed the following facts:—

1. That there is written tradition of its origin. Geoffrey of Monmouth, writing in the twelfth century, says that it was erected about A. D. 462, in memory of English noblemen slain by Hengist. 2. In the time of King James the then Duke of Buckingham excavated under the great central trilithon, and found "a great many bones of stagges and oxen—arrowheads, and pieces of armor eaten out with rust," thus showing that the work belongs to the age of iron. 3. Sir R. C. Hoare excavated in the same place, and found Roman and British pottery and a large arrowhead of iron. Mr. Cunningham found, at the depth of three feet, near the "altar," Roman pottery. Finally,

after the great trilithon fell, in 1797, Roman pottery was found in the earth which fell into the hole.

Similar facts are found in the dolmens (megalithic tombs) and *tumuli*. Those of Great Britain present in the same structure a mixture of stone, bronze, and iron implements, and frequently furnish coins of the Roman empire. Still more singularly to contradict the extravagant claims of antiquity, these coins are always of the later, and never of the earlier, emperors. Along the old Roman wall, and in various other Roman works, coins are abundant which reach back to the earliest emperors, but in the dolmens and *tumuli* none but the later emperors are represented. This important fact suggests the obvious inference that the works are later than the conquest of Julius Cesar, and probably made their appearance with the Saxons, and Danes or Norsemen. In one of them a large bronze ornament for a sword belt was found, bearing the following inscription in Runic characters: DOMNAL SELSHOFOTH A SOERTH THETA, which, translated, reads, "Domnal Sealshead owns sword this." Mr. Stephens refers it to about the ninth century after Christ, and Mr. Vigfusson to the eleventh century.

In other regions of the North similar facts exist. In a *tumulus* of the American mound-builders on the Atlantic coast an iron sword with an oaken hilt was exhumed. (See Smithsonian publications.)

In Denmark the cromlechs have yielded skeletons with well-woven woolen garments still unrotted in that damp climate, and yet Mr. Worsade claims for them an antiquity of twenty-five hundred years! Mr. Southall thinks they belong to the fifth century.

In Italy there are specimens of *tumuli* extending somewhat farther back, reaching, in our author's opinion, perhaps a very few centuries beyond the Christian era.

In India, the natives on the Khassia Hills, north of the Ganges, still erect megalithic monuments to the dead, which are almost exactly like those of England and France, and stand in thousands over their country.

It appears plainly that Mr. Southall has the best of the argument so far as megalithic monuments and *tumuli* are concerned, and that these works, though very interesting, are very far from being "prehistoric."

The Lake Dwellings.

In the winter of 1853–4 the water of the Swiss lakes was unusually low, which led to the discovery, at Meilen, on Lake Zurich, of a quantity of ancient piles standing in the mud of the bottom, and of numerous fragments of pottery, stone implements, etc., scattered among them.

Further investigation showed the existence of great numbers of such localities in the margins of the Swiss lakes, and to some extent in the lakes and marshes of other countries. The inhabitants of these villages drove piles in the bottoms of the lakes at a moderate distance from the shore, and on them constructed platforms of timber, and upon the platforms built their houses. Their communication with the shore was by a narrow bridge, which probably contained a draw-span. They also used canoes.

The very highest antiquity is not claimed for these pile villages, but it is maintained that the earlier ones belong to the Neolithic Age, and go back, in the opinion of Sir John Lubbock, Professor Gillièron, and M. Morlot, at least six thousand or seven thousand years, while the later ones came down to the Roman times. No relics of mammoth nor of the reindeer were found among them.

That no prehistoric antiquity can be claimed for pile villages merely because they are such, is evident by the fact that they both appear in history, and are still in existence. Herodotus describes in detail the pile dwellings of his day in Lake Prasius; and a friend of Sir John Lubbock, living in the region, informs him that the fishermen on that lake still adhere to the custom. Hippocrates (*De Noribus*, etc., xxxvii) describes similar dwellings on the Phasis, (now Rioni.) In a similar manner, Abulfeda, the geographer, writing only about five centuries ago, describes the Christian fishermen living in the same manner in the Appamæan Lake, (hence called the Lake of the Christians,) along the Orontes, not very far from the north-east corner of the Mediterranean Sea. Similar structures exist in numerous islands of the East Indian Archipelago; and the city of Mexico, when first founded by the Toltecs, was a pile-village.*

* "Prescott's Conquest of Mexico."

In spite of these perfectly established facts, and of the admitted numerous Roman relics in the Swiss pile villages, a writer says of these old Swiss villages that "they and their handiwork had sunk into oblivion before the Romans conquered Helvetia."

The distinction of the stone, bronze, and iron ages, so far as the pile villages are concerned, is an assumption without very definite proof. There were only a few in which the examination could be made in any other way than by dredging, which does not admit of careful observation as to the superposition of the relics of one age above those of another. Hence the writers speak of a "stone-age village," a "bronze station," or an "iron station," instead of successive strata in one place.

Practically, if they chance to find no metal, they refer the village to the stone age; if they find stone and some bronze articles, they call it a "bronze station;" and if they find any iron, they refer it to the Iron Age, however much stone or bronze there may be present. All three were often found together inextricably mixed, and not unfrequently stone implements were found abundantly with iron, and without any bronze. The following stations will give a fair idea of the discoveries:—

ROBENHAUSEN.—This was one of the few cases in which it was possible to examine successive strata. There were three layers, but no metal was found in any of them, hence they were all referred to the Stone Age. Fires had occurred in the dwellings, and perishable articles by being charred had been preserved from decay. They found down to the lowest stratum not only stone implements, but woven cloth, corn, apples, pottery, and flooring of the houses. In the next stratum the same thing occurred with the excrements of cows, sheep, and goats. All these things show that the people were by no means savages, yet this is set down as one of the very oldest of the Swiss stone-age settlements.

No actual articles of metal were discovered; but Dr. Keller says, in his work on the subject, that "the settlers, as has been supposed before, were in early times acquainted with copper and bronze, *for traces of these metals have been met with in the lower beds of the stone-age settlements.*

There were also various wooden articles, namely, a yoke, a flail, combs, a shoemaker's last, a large tub, and ladles, "showing an astonishing skill in carving." These things reveal a pretty well civilized agricultural people, who still, however,

used many stone implements. What there is about them which can prove a prodigious antiquity is more than we can tell. There seems no evidences of it, yet it is reckoned one of the oldest pile villages.

WANGEN.—This is another stone-age station, and yielded great quantities of corn, flax, "baked cakes of bread," and other proofs that "the inhabitants were pre-eminent as agriculturists and handicraftsmen." No metal was found, but some of the stone axes were perforated with holes for the handles. Mr. Southall thinks this conclusively proves the existence of metallic drills, but others contend that wooden drills by the help of wet sand will accomplish the work. American Indians drilled holes in stone implements by a hollow piece of cane filled with sand, which cut a circular groove, and removed a cylindrical core of stone. Something similar was obviously possible to these early Swiss villages, so that the drilling does not prove metal; yet when we find relics of a people who imported a favorite stone from Asia; who raised apples, flax, and corn; who threshed with a flail, and stabled in buildings over the lake goats, sheep, and cows; who carved elegant ladles for their dairies; who had yokes for their cattle, combs for their hair and lasts to make shoes on, it is not perfectly logical to assume that they were utterly ignorant of metals, merely because the excavations brought out no metallic tools, but only "traces of copper and bronze."

If we run briefly through the other principal stations we find as follows:—

LAKE OF CONSTANCE—WESTERN SHORE.—"Bronze Age Station," (so-called.) The articles were bronze celts, an iron knife, iron arrowheads, an iron fish-hook, flint implements, and pottery made without a wheel.

EASTERN SHORE.—*Nussdorf.*—Numerous implements of flint, fifty axes of nephrite imported from Asia, fifty perforated stone axes, drilled with a hollow tube, (probably of metal,) and remains of horses.

Maurach.—Stone implements, and a copper ax.

Unter Uhldingen.—Several hundred stone, bronze, and iron implements, with Roman pottery, and fragments of eleven glass goblets, and a glass slab. This shows that stone, bronze, iron, and glass were used at one and the same period.

Sipplingen.—This is reckoned a bronze station on account apparently of a single copper ax; yet there were found over three hundred stone implements, an iron lance-head, three iron arrowheads, two iron sickles, one iron sword, two iron cylinders, and one iron Roman key.

La Tène on Lake Neufchatel.—Numerous flint implements and flakes, fourteen bronze articles, fifty splendid iron swords, one iron scabbard inlaid with silver, Roman pottery, coins of the Roman emperors Claudius and Tiberius, coins of Marseilles, a gold coin of Helvetia, and a bad counterfeit of a coin of Philip of Macedon. Also, several cheap coins of ruder sorts.

Lake Geneva.—*Morges.*—Bronze celts and swords, an iron poignard, and a silver object.

Les Roseaux.—Stone, and bronze, and iron implements. Dr. Keller says the place was not inhabited long, yet the implements of all the three ages occur in it together.

It is not necessary to quote further details. The objects of stone, iron, and bronze are inextricably mixed; but yet it is to be observed that the western stations, which from their location had free trade with the Roman colony at Marseilles, furnish most specimens of iron and bronze, while those far off in the east appear to have used metals less and stone more. This is as might be expected in tribes dependent on trade for metallic tools.

On the whole, it appears impossible to classify the Swiss lake stations according to the three ages. It may be claimed that the three ages existed there, but that the articles were mixed by dropping on a common lake bottom, so that the difference of time is obliterated. Possibly this is so, but this very explanation concedes that the rule of three successive ages cannot be there made out. The fact is probably that stone and brass were in use long after iron had made its appearance. Bronze weapons have been found in the trenches of Cesar's camps, and doubtless stone, bronze, and iron were in use together, just as stone and iron are used by tribes to-day in America, though iron was introduced nearly four hundred years ago.

The opinion of Morlot and Lubbock, that the pile dwellings have a *minimum* antiquity of six thousand or seven thousand years, appears to be based on a calculation of Professor Gilliéron, of the college at Neuveville.

Sir John Lubbock gives the following account of the calculation to obtain a date for the lake habitation at the Pont de Thièle:—

This stream connected the Lakes of Neufchâtel and Bienne. During the first part of its course the valley is narrow, and the bridge, close to which the lake habitation has been discovered, is situated at the narrowest spot. A little farther down the valley suddenly expands, and from this point remains of the same width until it joins the Lake of Bienne. It is evident that the valley so far as the bridge over the Thièle was once occupied by the lake, which has gradually been silted up; and if we could ascertain how long it would have taken to effect this change, we should then know approximately the age of the remains (of the lake dwelling) found at the Pont de Thièle. The Abbey of St. Jean, which stands in the valley about three hundred and seventy-five meters from the present shore of the lake, is about seven hundred and fifty years old. It is possible that it may not have been built exactly on the edge of the lake; but even if this was the case, the gain of land will only have been three hundred and seventy-five meters in seven hundred and fifty years. Professor Gillièron does not compare with this the whole space between the convent and the lake dwelling, because in the narrowest part of the valley, in which the latter is situated, the gain may have been more rapid; but if we only go to the point where the basin contracts, we shall have a distance of three thousand meters, which would, upon these data, indicate a *minimum* antiquity of six thousand seven hundred and fifty years.

Sir John Lubbock grows eloquent over this proof; but Mr. Southall quietly upsets the whole calculation by calling attention to the fact that *Roman pottery and tiles* were among the articles found in this lake dwelling, which were certainly deposited within nineteen hundred years.

We shall have occasion again to show the utter carelessness of Sir John Lubbock in indorsing scientific blunders, provided they only prop up the theory of human antiquity.

The Kjökken Möddings, or Shell Heaps.

Along the eastern shore of Denmark lived an ancient tribe of fishermen. They gathered from the waters immense quantities of shell-fish, and heaped up the shells with other rubbish near their dwellings. These heaps are the kjökken möddings. The shells are principally those of oysters, mussels, cockles, and periwinkles. The oyster is no longer found in the Baltic, so that it is believed that it is much less salt now than formerly.

when Denmark is supposed to have been an archipelago which admitted sea currents and tides freely across its bosom. The shell mounds are also found on the Danish islands, in the Channel Islands of Great Britain, in Scotland, in France, as well as along the coast of America, from Nova Scotia to the Gulf of Mexico, and on the Pacific coast. The shell heaps in Denmark contain the bones of the urus, the stag, the wild boar, the roedeer, the dog, the fox, the seal, the otter, wolf, beaver, bear, mouse, and a wild ox smaller than the urus; but there are no relics of the mammoth, the rhinoceros, the musk-ox, reindeer, elk, sheep, or hare.

The implements are of flint, and generally rude in structure, though a few better ones are found. None are polished, and no metals are found. The evidence of an immense antiquity of the heaps rests solely on the unpolished and rude character of the flints, the absence of metal, and the disappearance of the oyster from the Baltic. Professor Worsade argues the antiquity from the unpolished character of the flints, "the remains of a much ruder people than those who erected the large Stone Age *tumuli*, and made the beautiful weapons found in them."

Professor Steenstrup, however, calls attention to the fact that well-worked flints do occur in the heaps occasionally, and that they are not to be expected frequently; for, while the *tumuli* were the honored tombs of chieftains, the kjökken möddings were but the refuse heaps of fishermen. He recalls the fact also that rude implements, as well as fine ones, occur in the *tumuli*. Among such a distant people the metals may have well been absent, or too rare and precious to be lost in the heaps, though well known on the shores of the Mediterranean. The Danish antiquaries admit that iron was unknown there before the Christian era, and bronze may well have been very scarce, and not long in use. The absence of the reindeer seems to show a much more recent people than the old reindeer hunters of the French and Belgian caverns. The urus proves nothing, as that is not a prehistoric animal, and in fact existed in Germany down to the sixteenth century.

Light may be thrown on the age of the Danish shell heaps by examination of those of Britain. The former were far out of the track of all civilized nations, the latter were within reach of Phenician and Roman commerce.

Mr. J. W. Flower, F. G. S., ("Anthropological Review,") found in the kjökken möddings of the Channel Islands bronze, iron, hand-made bricks, glass, and Roman pottery, including Samian ware. There is no reason for concluding that the Danish heaps are materially older than these. The disappearance of the oyster from the Baltic may well have occurred in the historic period, considering that the changes of level necessary to affect the free flow of sea currents into it would not be greater than have occurred elsewhere in a much shorter time. The oyster has almost absolutely disappeared from the coast of Maine, in the United States, without any change of level, within a moderate period, owing, as is supposed, to the effect of the saw-mills in filling the water with woody particles. The American heaps have yielded stone implements, pottery, copper ornaments, English coins, the bones of an infant wrapped in red silk, etc.

There is absolutely nothing on either continent to show that the shell heaps are "prehistoric" in the sense of "pre-Adamic."

The Bone Caves.

The study of the bone caves is a little complex, but its bearing on the question of human antiquity will be best understood by stating two or three points toward which all the arguments converge:—

1. There has been in Belgium, Northern France, and many other parts of Europe and America, a tremendous water disturbance, a deluge, if you please. 2. This deluge covered all Belgium, and many other regions, leaving a stratum of mud over the previous post-pliocene surface. It also entered the Belgium caves, and laid a floor of mud, which separates the deposits older than the inundation from those formed since and above it. 3. Under the undisturbed mud of this deluge are found the bones and rude implements of men, with bones of the mammoth, the *Rhinoceros tichorhinus*, the cave bear, cave hyena, cave lion, etc., in such relations as to leave little doubt that they were contemporaneous. This was the true Palæolithic, or Post-Pliocene Age. There is no sufficient proof that the mammoth has been seen alive in Europe since. 4. In one important cavern calculations have been made on the growth of the stalag-

mite covering human relics, from which an antiquity of enormous extent has been deduced.

These are the main points. Many minor ones are brought forward which have value in the eyes of particular men, but they are not generally accepted, and rest on false or dubious assumptions of various kinds.

As to the bearing of the main points, it is claimed that the striking geological changes shown by the inundation, and the change of climate supposed to be shown by the disappearance of the old fauna, require an immense period of time. It is claimed, especially, that the mammoth disappeared at a period far beyond the scope of sacred or profane history, and that to show that men were contemporaneous with that beast settles the whole question.

Mr. Southall gives the details of the discoveries in about every important cave ever excavated for "prehistoric" relics, but the mass of material is too great to be given in detail. It will be better to select as specimens those caverns most valued for proof.

Intrinsically, the best light has been thrown on the palæolithic men of the caverns by Dupont of Belgium, because he not only exhumed a vast number of relics, but found a distinct stratum dividing the Palæolithic from the Neolithic Age, namely, the mud deposit of the Franco-Belgian deluge. He also found the complete skulls and skeletons of the men of that day. He made his excavations under the auspices of the Belgian government, and did his work with great thoroughness. He accepts the usual continental notion of a great antiquity, but apparently his facts are not palatable to the continental archæologists, for in the place of their infinite ages of slow transition from palæolithic to neolithic times, his deluge stratum, called in that country the *Terre a Brique*, cuts the former abruptly off, and introduces neolithic relics suddenly, and without transition, above it. He has also, in common with Dawson and Boucher de Perthes, committed the mortal offense of suggesting that this great inundation (which affected large areas on both continents) may be the identical deluge of history and tradition. The French caves either did not have the advantage of this geological stratum, separating the different ages, or else it was overlooked by the excavators.

At any rate, MM. Lartet, Christy, and others, seem to rely exclusively on the character of the implements, and the presence or absence of bones of extinct animals and other similar methods to distinguish the periods, all of which are liable to be very deceptive.

The fact is, the determination of ages in caverns is subject to great difficulties. 1. The same streams which excavate the cavern, bring into it from the earth above bones and relics of all preceding ages mingled altogether. 2. These same streams cut into and rearrange the cave earth from time to time, mingling different ages. 3. The men using the caverns may grade the earth in it for their own convenience, excavating one part and filling up another, and burrowing animals supplement the work to some extent. For these reasons it is rare that the relics can be known to be in their original order of superposition; and it is an unusual and special advantage when a wide floor of stalagmite or a complete stratum of *Terre a Brique* subdivides the deposit in a reliable manner into different periods.

Dupont's facts are these: Below the *Terre a Brique* he found human skeletons, with well-developed skulls, of a type now living, and called by anthropologists "Uralo-Turanian." They showed no inferiority of form to the world's present inhabitants. There were countless thousands of flint implements, none of which were polished. There were ornaments of shell and of beautiful stones, such as fluor-spar, and many articles which had been imported from considerably distant regions. There were implements of bone, including elegant bone needles with well-drilled eyes, showing that the people were not naked, but possessed the art of sewing garments. Their fireplaces were found surrounded with the relics of their feasts, and among the rest a joint of the fore leg of a mammoth carefully laid away on a flat plate of stone. This bone was more decayed than the rest, leading to a doubt whether it was laid away as a joint of meat, or simply as a dry bone and an object of superstition or curiosity. However, the bones of the mammoth, the *Rhinoceros tichorhinus*, the cave bear, etc., were abundant, and connected with the relics of men, so as to give the highest probability that they were all contemporaneous. No metals were discovered.

Above the *Terre a Brique* all is changed. The mammoth,

the *Rhinoceros tichorhinus*, the cave bear, the cave hyena, etc., no longer occur; the stone implements are of a different type, and often polished; articles of bronze and iron are found, as also coins of various countries; and other relics of all ages, even down to the present day. In all this mass of material the chief thing that suggests a great antiquity is the association of palæolithic men with the extinct animals, which simply raises the question whether men are more ancient, or mammoth more recent, than was formerly supposed.

The caves of other European countries, though not generally showing the diluvian mud stratum, have yielded a still greater mass of relics, many of which are apparently truly palæolithic. The caverns of France not only show human bones mingled with those of the mammoth and other extinct animals, but have furnished specimens of the artistic efforts of the cave men. On a piece of reindeer's horn from La Madelaine two fishes are rudely sketched. On another piece is a fish, very rude, two horses' heads, pretty well drawn, and a native man. Another sketch gave a group of reindeer with considerable skill, and easily recognizable.

A sketch was found in Aquataine, drawn on reindeer's horn, representing a male bison pursued by a naked man, who grasped the tail with one hand, and plunged a spear into the animal's side with the other. The man had a beard, and his naked condition is taken as proof that the cave-dwellers had not yet developed to the clothes-wearing stage. Those who take this view have not yet explained what use they had for the numerous and beautiful bone needles found among the relics of their housekeeping. The most famous drawing of all is a congeries of scratches made on the convex surface of a broken piece of mammoth's tusk. This sketch is supposed to be intended to represent the mammoth itself. The engravings given of this celebrated fragment for the most part grossly exaggerate the degree of resemblance. Mr. Southall's copy, a *fac simile* of that in the Smithsonian publications, reverses the position of the animal, and, in common with other engravings, looks far more like a mammoth than the original sketch of the savage did. The writer of this review, after studying with interest several engravings and a plaster cast, was much disappointed when he came to see the original

ivory. The copies seemed to have had certain lines retouched, in order to show the animal more clearly. After intently studying the original for a considerable time, it seemed doubtful whether the scratches were intended to represent any thing whatever. It was possible to make out the form only by picking out certain lines from a tangled congeries and rejecting others equally prominent. Still a sort of resemblance exists, and if it were intended for a mammoth, it shows unquestionably that the savage had seen the beast alive.

Sir John Lubbock says that pottery was not found in the ancient caves; but he is mistaken in this, for Dupont reports it in Belgium, and other explorers found it in France along with bone needles, flint hatchets, and bones of extinct animals. Efforts were made some years ago to show that the cave-dwellers were a very low grade of humanity in point of brain development; in short, were in a state of transition from the apes. A fragment of skull was found in a cave at Neanderthal which created a profound sensation. This cranium was very low in the forehead, being, as Huxley observed, "the most pithecoid of skulls." However, in spite of its distorted form, it was not very small, and had a larger brain cavity than many men now living. There was no proof of its antiquity, for, though found in a cave, it was not found with the relics of extinct animals. Another skull which created a sensation was found associated with the extinct quadrupeds in a cave at Engis. It, however, showed no signs of inferiority. Professor Huxley remarks, "There is no mark of degradation about any part of its structure. It is, in fact, a fair average human skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage."

The skulls taken out at Bruniquel were well developed, and equal to those of Celtic stock now. Similar remarks apply to the skulls of the cave men of Eyzies. M. Quatrefages says that the male skull of Cro-Magnon "is remarkable for its capacity, and exceeds the average European skull of the present day." In like manner the three "fossil men of Mentone," belonging to the earliest Stone Age, all have fine skulls, and the same is true of the palæolithic skulls exhumed by Dupont from beneath the mud of the great Belgian deluge. If the famous Neanderthal skull, therefore, was really palæolithic, of

which there is no proof at all; it was merely a monstrosity, and had no more resemblance to other men of that day than analogous monstrosities have now. The palæolithic skulls found are not inferior to those of the average men now living.

There is a famous bone cave in Devonshire, England, called Kent's Hole. In this there are two floors of stalagmite, separated by strata of earth; and human relics, with bones of extinct animals, were found beneath the lowest. Mr. Evans and Mr. Boyd Dawkins, both distinguished investigators, doubt the authenticity of the lowest find of implements, because there were evidences of former excavations, breakages of the floors, and other disturbances of various kinds, which might have mingled the upper and lower relics. However, Mr. Vivian, in the meeting of the British Association for 1871, contended that if the deposition of stalagmite went on formerly as now, it would take a million of years to form these two floors. Mr. Evans more modestly observes that it would probably require thousands of years. Both gentlemen seem to have calculated from very scanty *data.* Wherever water contains carbonic acid, it will take up in solution any carbonate of lime over which it flows. If this solution trickle into a cave the carbonic acid escapes, and the carbonate of lime precipitates as stalactite and stalagmite. The carbonic acid is often exhaled in vast abundance from the deep unknown sources below, and also a steady supply is derived from the decay of vegetation above. The growth of stalagmite will, therefore, vary greatly, according to the varying supply of carbonic acid, lime, and water. At San Vignone, in Tuscany, a spring issues from the rock which deposits six inches of stalagmite every year in the conduit leading from it. At Martin's cave, Gibraltar, a copper plate with the ornamentation of the twelfth century on it was found under eighteen inches of stalagmite. Mr. Clausen broke a hole in the stalagmitic floor of a cavern in Brazil. A few years after he found this hole completely filled up with new material of the same sort. Mr. Boyd Dawkins observed in Ingleborough cave stalagmite which increased at a rate equal to twenty-nine and a half inches in a century. If that of Kent's Hole was deposited at an equal rate, the whole might have been formed since the time of Edward III. Mr. W. Bruce Clarke ("Nature," January 1, 1874) observed in a

cavern near Buxton stalagmite about an eighth of an inch thick, which had formed in six months on an iron pipe, which is at the rate of twenty-five inches in a century. Mr. Reclus states that at a cave in Adelsberg a skeleton was shown some years ago merely shrouded in a white coating of stalagmite, but is now buried in the thickness of it; and that the skeletons of the three hundred Cretans smoked to death by the Turks in 1822 in the cave of Melidhoni are gradually disappearing under the increasing stalagmite. In the United States, Professor Winchell says that in a lead cave near Dubuque, Iowa, stalactites three feet long have formed in three years. At Idaho Springs, in Colorado, a bath-house was built a few years ago, and the chips, and other objects dropped in the steam, are already covered with stalagmite. In Europe there are places where this fact is made a source of profit, various objects, such as birds'-nests with the eggs, imitation bouquets, etc., are coated thickly with stone by exposing them to the action of the water for a moderate period. They are then sold to visitors as petrifactions.

The fact is, stalagmite has no definite rate of growth. In favorable circumstances it will form in a cave with prodigious rapidity; but any change diverting the supply of water, or cutting off the access of carbonic acid, may arrest it. That any scientific man should ever have imagined that it could be used a sa measure of an antiquity running back through all sorts of changing conditions, is merely one of the many incomprehensible vagaries which have cropped out in the investigation of "prehistoric times."

The so-called "extinct" animals of palæolithic caves are not really all exterminated. The cave bear has recently been identified with the American grizzly, and only differs from the present brown bear of the north of Europe in being larger. Scientific men assert also that the cave hyena is the spotted hyena of Africa, and that the bones of the cave lion are identical with those of the present Asiatic lion. It may be stated in addition that the bones of the modern African elephant have been found in Spanish caves, and also in Italy. It appears, therefore, to be pretty well proved: 1. That the Palæolithic Age was closed out in Belgium and France by a great inundation, which some scientific men think was a part of the

great historical deluge, and that the first relics found after that are of a different and higher type; and that in Belgium, at least, the Palæolithic Age did not merge slowly into the Neolithic, as has so often been loosely assumed. 2. The mammoth and *Rhinoceros tichorhinus* were contemporaneous with men before the inundation, but, so far as can now be ascertained, have not been seen alive since that catastrophe, their bones not occurring above the inundation mud; but the cave bear, cave lion, cave hyena, hippopotamus, musk ox, and reindeer are identical with animals still existing in other regions. The ordinary phrases about an "extinct fauna" and "the disappearance of the old fauna," and "the introduction of a new fauna," so often appearing in the works of eminent men, in this connection are scientifically false. No fauna has become extinct since palæolithic times. We have merely lost a very few species out of it; neither has any new fauna been introduced, as all our present species, so far as we know, existed then. Now, in view of the fact that during the tranquil times of modern history several species have become extinct, it is not surprising that a few others succumbed during the more violent changes of the ancient period. There is no scientific proof whatever that any enormous time was consumed in the extinction of the *Elephas primigenius* (mammoth) and the *Rhinoceros tichorhinus*. 3. The oldest cave men were physically and mentally equal to the average of the nations now living, having well-developed skulls of good form. The supposed degraded specimens, like that at Neanderthal, are merely individual deformities, in no wise worse than analogous specimens now alive. 4. The paleolithic cave men were artisans in stone, ivory, horn, bone, and wood. They ornamented themselves with paints, crystals, and shells. 5. They made clothing with the aid of needles and thread. 6. They had music, and constructed bone flutes. They also showed some skill in drawing. 7. They trafficked with distant regions, and brought nephrite even from Asia. 8. "They buried their dead with reverence and decency," and seem to have had a religion, but are suspected of cannibalism. They seem to have been in many respects much in the condition of the Esquimo Indians, who, despite their climate, are considerably above the ordinary red Indian of the north and west.

archæologists fancied that they belonged to the close of palæolithic time, because they found some unpolished, but very finely-worked flints; but such minute distinctions are utterly unreliable, as one tribe or settlement will often do fine work, while another much later may be far more rude in handiwork. These villagers, palæolithic and contemporary with the mammoth, were by no means mere savages. Like their cousins, the modern Mongolians, they were in the pastoral stage of civilization, and derived their principal subsistence apparently from their vast herds of horses, which they doubtless used also for riding and for beasts of burden. It does not appear whether the habitations over the stone hearths were wooden houses or tents.

The Gravel and Peat of the Valley of the Somme, in France.

That great geological riddle, the period of the Bowlder Drift, seems to have preceded the advent of man. From time to time discoveries have been announced that human relics have been found in it, and even under it, but hitherto no such discoveries have stood the test of investigation. Though the Bowlder Drift phenomena may possibly have been active in some countries, while men lived in others, it is difficult to prove it, and in the main we must accept that period as the ancient boundary of human existence. With the close of the Bowlder Drift came in the period, variously called the "Quaternary," "Palæolithic," or "First Stone Age." This was the period of the mammoth, the *Rhinoceros tichorhinus*, the cave bear, and probably also of the American mastodon. This "Quaternary" or "Palæolithic" Age in Belgium, in many parts of the United States, and in various other regions, was terminated by the coming on of the tremendous deluge of the Loess. Whether some part of this catastrophe constituted the deluge described in tradition and in Scripture cannot at present be determined; but in Belgium, at least, neither palæolithic man nor the mammoth were ever seen alive after it. At this period much of the higher ground of France seems to have escaped actual submergence, but to have had tremendous floods rushing down its valleys, depositing vast beds of valley gravel far above the level of the present stream. In these

river gravels the bones and implements of the palæolithic folk are entombed with the mammoth and the *Rhinoceros tichorhinus*. This is the "Quaternary" gravel, often called by Europeans the "Drift," though later than the Bowlder Drift proper. It is only a river drift.

In the north-west of France runs the little river Somme, in one of these wide, gravel-lined valleys. Thirty-five years ago M. Boucher de Perthes began to find flint implements of a rude character, and ultimately human bones, with those of the mammoth, etc., in these gravels, far above the modern reach of the river, and sometimes more than fifteen feet below the surface. His statements were received at first with incredulity, and many a hot discussion followed. The region around was searched, and more relics were found, and ultimately great numbers were discovered, both in France, England, and in other countries. The relics were all of the Palæolithic Age, and evidently belonged to the same period as those found in the older cave deposits.

The question at once arose about the probable age of these human relics. Sir Charles Lyell ("Prehistoric Times") estimated it at eight hundred thousand years, but Sir John Lubbock thought it not over two hundred and forty thousand years. The following extract from Mr. Evans's "Ancient Stone Implements of Great Britain" shows the prevalent style of talk on the subject:—

> But when we remember that the traditions of the mighty and historic city (London) now extending across the valley (of the Thames) do not carry us back even to the close of that period of many centuries, when a bronze-using people occupied this island; when we bear in mind that beyond that period lies another of probably far longer duration, when our barbaric predecessors sometimes polished their stone implements, but were still unacquainted with the use of metallic tools; when to the Historic, Bronze, and Neolithic Ages we mentally add that long series of years which must have been required for the old fauna, with the mammoth and rhinoceros, and other, to us, strange and unaccustomed forms, to be supplanted by a group of animals more closely resembling those of the present day; and when, remembering all this, we realize the fact that all these vast periods of years have intervened since the completion of the excavation of the valley and the close of the palæolithic period, the mind is almost lost in amazement at the vista of antiquity displayed.—P. 622.

This is a very fine piece of rhetoric, but the inquiring mind naturally seeks for something like facts to support such ponderous assertions. Now the facts are that the history of London reaches back to the Bronze Age, that the Bronze and Neolithic Ages ran on largely together, and as to the Palæolithic Age, its duration is one of the unproved assertions. European *savans*, with all their merits, when they get on this subject seem to largely abandon facts, taking to the wings of imagination, and setting off on a general cloud-race, to see who can most glorify the antiquity of the palæolithic gravel.

The assumption of Sir John Lubbock is this: The little river Somme, perhaps fifty feet wide, began its course before the valley was cut. Little by little he supposes it made a channel with its present amount of water, leaving gravel banks on its sides, and the palæolithic folk lived there, and fished and hunted, and left their implements in those upper gravels. As the ages wore away the river cut deeper into the rock, abandoned its upper gravels, and laid new terraces lower down, and the men moved down also. So cutting its way down, and meandering this way and that, the little creek, with always about its present amount of water, gradually, through hundreds of thousands of years, nibbled out its valley of two hundred feet in depth and a mile and a half in width, and all this time men lived there. After the valley was thus completed the great peat beds began to grow, and thirty thousand years more or less are claimed for them alone.

One source of great errors in Sir John Lubbock and others was, that being absorbed in the study of the implements, they made a very imperfect and loose examination of the physical geology of the valley. M. Boucher de Perthes, who lived in it, and studied it all his life-time, announced that the gravel-beds were the effect of a great water disturbance of a remarkable character. "*Cataclysme qui donna à notre pays sa configuration presente.*" Lyell and Lubbock were habitually opposed to allowing any thing in geology to be done by catastrophes, and so without properly considering the points, which might determine that question, they coolly set aside Boucher de Perthes's carefully formed opinion, and substituted the theory that the results were due to a very long action of the present little trickling stream, and the other *savans* followed suit.

Professor Andrews, of Chicago, examined the ground, and pointed out the impossibility of Lubbock's theory. Professor Dawson, the celebrated geologist of Montreal, examined the valley about the same time, and came independently to the same conclusion as Professor Andrews. At a later period, Alfred Tylor, F. G. S., of England, (Quarterly Journal, Geol. Soc., May, 1867,) examined the valley very thoroughly, with the help of French civil engineers, and came to the conclusion that the whole theory of Lubbock and Lyell, that the gravels were the slow successive deposits by a small stream, was a pure figment of the imagination, and that the "terraces," marking the supposed successive levels, though figured by Lubbock in an engraving, actually had no existence. The gravel lay in a continuous sheet up the sides of the valley, and Lubbock mistook a few isolated knobs of rock, projecting above the sheet, for a division of it into separate terraces. Our author thus summarizes Professor Andrews's article:—

Dr. Andrews states that the river Somme, at Amiens, is a small stream, apparently some fifty feet in width, meandering along the flat floor of an ancient water-course of much greater dimensions. The valley is about a mile and a half in breadth from summit to summit of the bluffs, and not far from two hundred feet in depth. In the lower part of its course it is purely a valley of erosion, excavated in soft chalk; but above Amiens it expands into wide irregular basins, which are apparently the natural undulations of the surface, which existed before the land rose from the sea, and which are now connected by valleys of erosion, cut from one to another. Upon the floor of the valley, and extending far up the sides, are the famous gravel beds, which sometimes attain a thickness of twenty feet. Upon the low based gravels rests a bed of peat about twenty-six feet thick. Near Amiens Dr. Andrews observed evidence, that at the time the deposit was formed, blocks of ice, or of mixed ice and frozen gravel, three or four feet in diameter, were laid down in the strata, and that these blocks were completely covered, and had other strata laid over them before they had time to melt. There is also proof that the river which did this work had a volume of not less than one thousand times that of the ordinary summer stream of the Somme. The facts are these: The mass of the upper gravels consists of chalk flints mixed with angular fragments, powder of crushed chalk, and rolled chalk pebbles and bowlders, the whole being of a bright gray tint. Upon the gray gravel lies a thin stratum of dark colored gravelly clay. Over this is a brown gravel, and above that the surface stratum of the region, the *Terre a Brique* of France and Belgium, which Dupont found capping over the palæolithic deposits even in the caves. In

the gray gravel below there are places where the strata above have fallen in, as if a block of ice below had melted out, and let the lower clay seam and the brown gravel over it settle down into the cavity; after which every thing was washed smooth on the surface, and then the *Terre a Brique* laid on, showing that the whole was finished at the Loess Period. A fine example was seen in the upper gravel pits at Amiens. Here the gray gravel was missing for a horizontal distance of about four feet, the space being filled with confused materials from the darker strata above. The sides of the interrupted space were nearly perpendicular, and the thin dark clay stratum, which once had evidently extended across the top of the space, had settled and broken in the center, the parts falling in against the sides of the space below and hanging perpendicularly, the brown gravel above then falling in. The conclusion is obvious that this space was once filled with a block of ice, (containing probably gravel,) and that the deposit of material was so rapid that it was covered over completely, and the thin clay and the brown gravel strata, amounting in all to near seven feet, were laid on above it before the ice had time to melt. As the ice liquefied the strata above settled and fell into its place, and soon afterward the wider flood of the *Terre a Brique* smoothed every thing over at the top.

Sir Charles Lyell, in a rather careless way, noticed similar curious contortions of the strata, and attributed them to ice action, but did not analyze them sufficiently to see their bearing on the size of the stream and the rapidity of the deposit:—

An examination of the gray gravel confirms the idea of ice action. It consists of chalk flints, rolled bowlders, and pebbles of chalk, and broken angular fragments of chalk of every size. Many of the soft chalk fragments have preserved the sharpness of their angles (formed as they were broken from the strata) so perfectly that it does not seem that they could have been rolled a hundred feet on the bottom. They must have been dropped from floating ice, or deposited by ice-fields coming down the stream, crushing the projecting angles of the chalk strata, and leaving the *débris* wherever the irregularities of the channel permitted. The agency of ice is also emphatically indicated by the presence of large boulders of sandstone, some of which weigh a ton. These must have been transported from far up the stream, as the rocks in the vicinity are exclusively chalk. Sir John Lubbock contends that the valley was excavated by the gentle action of the river, through hundreds of thousands of years, with about its present volume of water. Dr. Andrews remarks that the valley is a mile and a half wide at the top, and the present river about fifty feet in breadth. If we allow, with Sir John, considerable increase for spring floods, the water spread over the whole valley might attain at times the depth of half an inch. This is obviously inadequate to the float-

ing of great ice-fields, and the deposit of gravel beds, containing pebbles larger than a man's head and bowlders weighing a ton. The valley presents none of the characters of one widened by the irregular action of a small stream, now eroding this bank and now that. It is broad, level-floored, and parallel-banked. The stream that excavated it filled it from bluff to bluff, and the gravel deposit, instead of being in separate terraces, laps down the slope like a great blanket.

The conclusions which Dr. Andrews draws from these facts are: "1. That the ancient river and the ancient rainfall were for a time immensely greater than now. 2. The rapidity of the gravel deposit was, at least in some places, very great, and the time proportionately short." If six feet of it was deposited while a buried block of ice was melting, it is impossible to claim two hundred thousand years for the remaining ten or fifteen feet.

But the bottom gravels are covered with twenty-six feet of peat, the time of whose growth is to be added to the antiquity of the gravel. M. Boucher de Perthes sought to determine the rate of growth of the peat, but this being a forest peat, and not one of the moss growths, he was naturally unacquainted with the phenomena involved in such cases, and overlooked his most important data, an error perhaps excusable in a country where few trees are allowed to grow and none to decay, and consequently the growth of forest peat is never seen. The peasantry on the ground informed him that there was at present no increase of the peat, in which they were undoubtedly correct; but M. Boucher de Perthes took up the notion that they must be mistaken, and the growth merely too slow for them to observe. There are great numbers of relics found in the peat of every age except the palæolithic, and Boucher de Perthes in one instance found some Roman articles within ten inches of the surface. He says he generally found the Roman relics to extend down about six and a half feet, but seems to have been ignorant of the fact that they have also been found at the very bottom of the deposit. He also had an idea that perhaps many articles might gradually sink through the peat, and thus be found lower down than they belonged; but peat, though soft, is rather tough and fibrous, and large articles, such as Roman boats, for instance, could not sink in it. However, M. Boucher de Perthes took the articles

which were nearest the surface for his starting-point, and without any correction by other means, took the ten inches of peat over them as the measure of the accretion from the Roman times till now. Dividing the ten inches by the number of centuries, he deduced about one and a half or two inches a century as the rate of growth for the peat of the Somme, and applying this to the twenty-six feet thickness of the beds, he concludes that they occupied at least fifteen thousand or twenty thousand years in their growth.

Dr. Andrews, being a practical woodsman, sees things in a different light. His criticisms are thus condensed by Mr. Southall:—

M. Boucher de Perthes states that he has found deep in the peats of the Somme numerous trunks of trees standing erect where they grew. These trunks were sometimes a meter (39.14 inches) in height, but generally less, [mostly birches and alders.] On this Dr. Andrews remarks that as stumps of trees do not stand long without decay when uncovered in the damp air of a swamp, it follows that all which are found standing erect in the peat must have been covered to their present summits before they had time to rot away. Applying M. Boucher's estimate of one and a half or two inches a century for the growth of the peat, some of the above-mentioned stumps must have stood uncovered without decay from one thousand nine hundred and fifty years to two thousand six hundred years! Now, one hundred years is a long life-time for even an oak stump in such circumstances, and every trace of almost any other tree would disappear in fifty years. Birch stumps are especially perishable. There were also prostrate trunks of oak in the peat four feet in diameter, and so sound that they were manufactured into furniture. They must have been covered by the peat in a hundred years. The rest of the calculation is easily made.

The observation of the peasants to Boucher de Perthes, that there is at present no increase of the peat, is doubtless true, and very easily explained:—

The beds of the Somme belong to the class of forest peats, and not to that of the moss growths. Forest peats, as may be seen in thousands of localities in the United States, are formed as follows: The annual crop of twigs, leaves, and wind-fall trunks furnished by the trees and shrubbery of a dense swamp amounts to an immense mass of vegetable matter. These, added to a thick undergrowth of grass, herbs, and moss, are all pressed against the ground by the winter snows. In the spring they are flooded, and thus protected from decay. In the summer they are partly

preserved from oxygenation by the extreme wetness of the soil into which they have been pressed. Hence, they are only slightly rotten when they are finally covered up by the fall of the next autumn's crop. To one who studies the actual quantity of this material, a growth of two or three feet in a century is by no means improbable. The increase of the peat *depends on the presence of the forest.* But the forests of the Somme have disappeared centuries ago. It is not, therefore, remarkable that M. Boucher de Perthes could not observe any perceptible increase of peat at the present time. Hardly an ounce of grass or a stick of wood ever rots, at present, upon the valley, every particle of vegetable matter being appropriated for the use of the inhabitants. About Amiens the ground is all drained and used for market gardens, and in other parts it is sown for crops, mown for hay, or grazed for pasture. The peat growth is therefore arrested, and no further increase will be observed though a million of years should elapse. Dr. Andrews adds, that he has no means of knowing when the forests disappeared, but presumes that places like Amiens, which were Roman garrisons, would be the largest settlements, and soonest cleared of timber. Probably the place where the Roman remains are most found may have been destitute of timber, and produced no peat for the last six or seven hundred years. If so, the deposit of six feet (it is often greatly more than this) over the Roman remains was accomplished in about twelve hundred years, or at the rate of six inches in a century. Where stumps a meter in height are preserved, the accretion must have been much greater; but taking this as the probable standard, the age of the whole bed would not be far from five thousand two hundred years down to the cessation of the peat growth. It is impossible to pretend to minute accuracy in such calculations, but the facts given are sufficient to show that in the eyes of practical woodsmen the enormous European estimates of time need pruning.

Mr. Southall takes the matter up here and adduces facts which show that Dr. Andrews, much as he pruned the European estimates, by no means cut them down enough. M. Boucher de Perthes describes excavations made at Abbeville, which reached through all the peat down to the chalk. There were several beds of calcareous tufa, sand, peat, etc., interstratified in such a manner that Lyell's idea that any relics had sunk from the surface through them all to the bottom is rendered absurd. Yet, here in the lowest stratum of peat, articles of iron, copper, etc., are discovered. In other places relics of Roman age, such as a boat loaded with bricks, are found at the very bottom. At all sorts of depths are found articles of iron, of copper, of wheel-made pottery, a statuette

of St. Lawrence in ivory, Roman *amphoræ*, coins of the Roman emperors, etc.

Mr. Southall exposes some astounding specimens of blundering in certain archæologists, who seem to pardon any extravagance if it only tends toward a prodigious antiquity. As intimated above, M. Boucher de Perthes selected some Roman dishes within ten or fifteen inches of the surface as his *data* for calculation. He reckoned them to be about fourteen hundred years old, and consequently the peat had in his estimation accreted over them at the rate of about an inch (three centimeters) in a century, and from this *datum* he calculates the age of the entire bed. Now, Boucher de Perthes himself states that this same bed of peat in which he found his dishes dips under the city of Abbeville, where it is overlaid with sundry other strata twenty feet thick or more, so that not only half the peat bed, but all the twenty feet of other deposits, must come into his fourteen hundred years. Yet, below this lowest peat bed was a post-Roman, wheel-turned vase, which he thinks "sunk" to its present position. It suffices to say that vases will not sink twenty-three feet through surface soil, calcareous tufa, sand, peat, and again sand, as would be necessary to suppose in this case.

Boucher de Perthes figures a section of the deposits at Abbeville, and the relics found in them, as follows:—

First Bed or Modern Soil: Arts of civilization, scoriæ, glazed pottery, etc. Second Bed: Transition from modern times to the Middle Ages—Iron, some copper, French, Flemish, Spanish coins, Venetian glass, etc. Third Bed: Middle Ages—Coins of the first races, and of the Lower Empire, in bronze, zinc, and gold; but little silver; less of iron than copper, etc. Fourth Bed: Gallo-Roman Epoch—Marbles, statues, fragments of columns, stone tombs, coins of the Consular Age; iron more rare, copper keys; bronze figures, etc. Fifth Bed: Gaulish Period—Iron more and more rare; swords and lances are of copper; Gaulic coin of gold, but not of silver; some Greek pieces, etc. Sixth Bed: First Celtic Period—Broken bones, ashes, cinders, rude vases; no iron, a few relics of copper, stone hatchets, (polished,) with their sheaths, etc. Seventh Bed: Second Celtic Period—Vases, ashes, charcoal, broken and calcined bones, flint implements, etc. Eighth Bed: *Diluvium*, or drift; (no relics;) broken and rolled flints, sand. We find it here admitted that metallic implements are found generally in the sixth bed, that is, at the depth of thirty-five feet.

It also appears that Roman relics are found to the very bottom of the peat, and Mr. Southall's opinion is that all the peat there accumulated within some twenty-five hundred years, the floods of the river, or other natural causes, being probably unfavorable to its growth before that time.

The Pluvial Period.

Dr. Dawson, Dr. Andrews, and Mr. Alfred Tylor, F. G. S., were all struck with the evidences in the valley of the Somme, and elsewhere, that there had been a great water disturbance, which sent floods down the river valleys with enormous force, and at one time laid the *Terre a Brique* even beyond the valley limits. Mr. Tylor calls this the "Pluvial Period," and attributes it to the great rains, etc., connected with the melting away of the ices of the Glacial Period. Boucher de Perthes had previously the same evidences of overflow, and referred it to the "traditional deluge," which, however, he was disposed to push far back into antiquity.

M. Dupont, excavating under the auspices of the Belgian Government, came upon the same period, and ascertained that it did not follow, as Tyler supposes, close on the Glacial Period, but was preceded by a low-water age—the age of the palæolithic men. This deluge in Belgium and northern France did not merely fill the river valleys. It entered the caverns, and submerged the whole country, hill and valley alike. Dupont also suggests its identity with the traditional deluge.

Professor Dawson, of Montreal, the distinguished Canadian geologist, as also Boucher de Perthes, Dupont, and others, advance the same idea. This almost irresistible suggestion of the identity of the one great deluge of archæology with the one great deluge of Scripture and tradition, was received with contemptuous silence by the advocates of great antiquity. Though in itself an idea of the very highest interest, the admission of it did not harmonize with the objects they had in view. However, the fact of great deluges either in, or at the close of, the Palæolithic Period, became too clear to be denied, and the theory of accounting for all the phenomena without them, as propounded by Lyell and Lubbock, may be considered as overthrown. Numerous eminent men now concede the facts. M. Figuier, in his popular work on "Primitive Man," expresses

the present opinions of many when he says: "A great catastrophe, the tradition of which is preserved in the memory of all nations, marked in Europe the end of the Quaternary Period."

Dupont says that in Belgium this flood reached the height of four hundred and fifty feet. In the United States it submerged, according to Hilgard, nearly all the Gulf States, while it covered large portions of the country around the great lakes, and in the vicinity of the Mississippi. Its effects are also reported in South America; and there is every reason to think, though the proof is not yet complete, that the vast deposits of frozen mud, inclosing the unrotted carcases of the mammoth and rhinoceros in Siberia, are of the same age. The effects of the catastrophe will doubtless yet be heard from in various other parts of the globe when investigations are more fully made. These inundations did not cover all the land, but in many regions they far exceeded the requirements of the Scripture accounts, namely, that it extended "under the whole (visible) heavens." That is, as far as the eye could reach. It was a most prodigious disturbance, and it is interesting to trace the apparent parallelism of the Scripture and the geological history in connection with it. Here are the two records:—

Geology.	Scripture
Glacial drift, great ice and water disturbances, etc.	Disorder previous to man's creation.
Dry lands, Palæolithic Age, primitive man, mammoth, mastodon, etc.	Dry land, Antediluvan Age, primitive man.
Great Deluge, whose deposits have received various local names, as Loess, *Terre a Brique*, etc. Mammoth, etc., disappear from Belgium.	Great deluge.
Low water, modern men, and animals.	Low water, modern men, and animals.

Hasty attempts to connect geological and scriptural history are apt to result in false inferences and deserved ridicule. It is well to allow the geological part of the history, which is still very imperfect, to develop itself more thoroughly, before indulging in positive conclusions; but in the mean time it is impossible to avoid being struck with the apparent identity of these two independent accounts.

Art. II.—SYMBOLISM OF THE PRE-CHRISTIAN CROSS.

The universality of the cross as a religious symbol in all ages and among all peoples is a surprising fact. That it should have prevailed as an arbitrary and convenient sign for any well-known fact, or represented a sound in language, is no more than what might have been expected as a product of the first attempts toward civilization. However, antiquity did not thus limit its significance, but by a strange coincidence, as yet in a measure beyond the explanation of the most thoughtful, attached to it a religious meaning—made it to represent some fundamental idea in connection with divinity in the mythologies of both the Old and New Worlds.

Now that the cross of Christ is taking the world—is supplanting faiths whose beginnings are so remote that chronology fails to reveal them—it would prove an interesting coincidence to the Christian antiquarian to observe the use of this same symbol in connection with the religion of only one of the nations of antiquity. But to observe that it has ever been in universal use, and is destined to retain its connection with the religious idea in man, is enough to excite a feeling of mingled surprise and interest. The early writers on the cross, headed by that eminent authority, Lipsius,* at once settled upon the conclusion that these multifarious decussated figures, which they found graven on the monuments and relics of antiquity, were of a typical character, and expressive of a sentiment implanted in the human heart, which looked forward to the true cross of Christ. And as remain after remain of ancient peoples was discovered, revealing the knowledge and use of this symbol, some new champion of the theory established by Lipsius sprang up to discourse upon the typical notion of the cross innate in the human mind. Only two notable authors, to our knowledge, in as many centuries, failed to indorse this view. One of them, Sir Thomas Brown,† only ventured to make inquiries for others to answer; while the other, Edward Gibbon, flew to the extreme of ridiculing, with unsparing pen, the resemblances to

* *Lipsius: De Cruce.* 12mo. Antwerp, 1595. Especially see lib. i, cap. ix.

† "The Garden of Cyrus; or, the Quincuncial Lozenge, or Net-work Plantations of the Ancients," etc., (orig. ed., 1658.) New ed., Bohn, 1852, vol. ii, p. 56 *et seq.*

the figure of the cross that other writers had attempted to establish as existing in nature and art.* Some allowance is due for the ardor with which the prevalent view was adopted by ecclesiastical writers. Besides the testimony of obelisk and temple, tomb and vase, in the Old World, the missionaries to the New World brought back the singular news, that across the deep, among a people whom they could scarce suspect of having a common origin with themselves, the cross was common as a symbol of their pagan worship.†

While these early authors were excusable for their many fanciful conjectures with reference to the origin of the cross as a religious sign among a barbarous people, modern authors, in the absence of any real authority, are scarcely justified in the sweeping conclusion which makes the form and idea of the cross an object of divine revelation, as does Mr. Haslam in his treatise on the subject.‡ It would be an agreeable solution of this problem if authority warranted it; but, unfortunately for our own wishes and Mr. Haslam's theory, it does not warrant any thing of the sort. To state, as does the author, that the cross was known to Noah, and even to Adam in the garden, by divine revelation, while Old Testament Scripture is destitute of any allusion to it, savors too much of emotional rhetoric to serve as the foundation for a rational theory. It is evident that while the cross was in general use among different peoples, its immediate and apparent signification was quite varied. But it is a question worth asking, and even more, worth a careful examination, whether underlying these several significations there was not one truth common to all—a thought to which all pointed, and of such a character that we may attribute its origin to the promptings of the immortal spirit which dwells within us. In all we read the struggle of the soul in its

* "Decline and Fall," chap. xx.

† Herrera: *Hist. General, de las Indias.* dec. 2, lib. iv, cap. vi; and many other places, for which see index, ed. of Barcia, Madrid, 1730, fol. Also Bernal Diaz: *Hist. de la Conquista*, cap. xxv *et seq.* Madrid, fol., 1632, and Mexico, 1854. Also Gomera: *Cronica*, cap. x *et seq.*, fol. ed., 1554. Also Peter Martyr: *De Insulis nuper inventis.* Mr. Prescott cites an additional source to which we have not had access, namely, "Manuscript of Las Casas."

‡ William Haslam: "The Cross and Serpent; being a brief History of the Triumph of the Cross through a long Series of Ages in Prophecy, Types, and Fulfillment." Oxford, 1849.

attempts, by means of visible signs to express a hope common to all men, without respect to their condition, or the degree of their civilization or barbarism. We will observe the significance attached to the various representations of the cross, first, among the nations of the Old World, and later, consider the symbolism of the cross in America separately, because of its own peculiarities.

Inseparably connected with the mythology of Egypt is the familiar symbol known as the *crux ansata*, or "handle cross." It has been called the "Key of the Nile," because of its almost universal presence on Egyptian and Coptic monuments. At the close of the fourth century it was known to the Egyptian Christians, who pronounced it "the symbol of eternal life." * Later Egyptologists, while unable to assert so much, are agreed that it at least signified "life." † But this strange symbol, involving the mystery of mysteries not only of the Egyptians, but of the Chaldeans and Phenicians, had yet a deeper meaning. The form of this handle cross was that of a Tau, or our letter T, surmounted by an oval or small circle—hence its name. This appellation was, no doubt, suggested by the fact of its sometimes being represented on tablets, as being borne in the hand of a priest by means of the roundlet. On Babylonian as well as on Egyptian remains the upper member of the symbol is often represented as a handle. In the Theban catacombs it is carried as a bucket. On a Babylonian cylinder in Munster's "Paris Cabinet of Antiquities," it is upheld in the presence of a king or god. It is represented on a small plate affixed to the end of the pole of a war chariot, and was, no doubt, placed there as a charm which should bring immunity from death or disaster; and a remarkable instance of the severance of the handle from the cross is seen on a stele from Korasabad, where an eagle-headed man is depicted as holding the oval in one hand and the cross in the other.‡ To the Egyptians, it was undoubtedly

* Socrates: *Hist. Eccl.*, v, 17; Sozoman: vii, 15; Theodoret: v, 22; and Rufinus ii, 26–29.

† Dr. Max Uhlman: *Handbuch der gesammten Ægyptischen Alterthumskunde—I Theil, Geschichte der Ægyptologie.* 8vo., p. 108. Leipzig, 1857. The author says that the handle cross means *life* is manifest from the Rosetta inscription and other texts.

‡ Botta: *Mon. de Ninive*, vol. ii, pl. 158; and "Edinburgh Review." January, 1870, p. 231.

of the most sacred character; and the mystery attached to it is manifested from its associations, as found on temples and monuments.

M. Mariette recently, while exploring the ancient temple of Denderah, discovered this secret symbol in a niche of the holy of holies.* It is probable that this emblem was the central object of interest in these inner precincts of the temple. It was preserved with scrupulous care as the "hidden wisdom." An eloquent and scholarly writer in the "Edinburgh Review," (Jan., 1870, p. 230,) in speaking of its form, remarks: "Thus it was figured on the gigantic emerald or glass statue of Serapis, which was transported, (B. C. 293,) by order of Ptolemy Soter, from Sinope, on the southern shores of the Black Sea, re-erected within that famous labyrinth which encompassed the banks of Lake Moeris, and destroyed by the victorious army of Theodosius, (A. D. 389,) despite the earnest entreaties of the Egyptian priesthood to spare it, because it was the emblem of their god and of "the life to come!" Macrobius † expresses the opinion that the *crux ansata* was the hieroglyphic sign of Osiris, or the sun, and refers to the fact that when the ancient Egyptians wished to symbolize Osiris they set up "a staff with an eye upon it, because in antiquity the sun was known as the eye of God." A quite plausible explanation of the significance of the symbol is put forth by an interesting German author,‡ who, after referring to the above, claims that the round portion represented the orb of the sun, the perpendicular bar signified the rays of the high mid-day sun, and the shorter horizontal bar symbolized the rays of the rising or setting sun.

Life, and the reproduction of life, and the renewal of the decaying powers of nature, was directly symbolized, with, no doubt, an indirect reference through and back of it all to the power of the divinity to call humanity from death to a renewed life. In the Egyptian "ritual of the dead" the wonderful reconstruction of the body of the deceased whose parts are to be reunited is celebrated. As Isis descended into Hades, and sought for those of Osiris and brought them again together, so will it

* John Newton, in Appendix to Inman's "Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism." 8vo., p. 116. London, 1874.

† Saturn, i, 20.

‡ Zöckler: *Das Kreuz Christi.* 8vo., p. 9 *et seq.* Gütersloth, 1875.

be with the human body. "The trials are recorded through which the deceased passes, and by which all remaining stains of corruption are wiped away; and the record ends where the defunct is born again glorious, like that sun which typified the Egyptian resurrection."* Apuleius, (Metam., cap. ix,) who had been initiated into the mysteries of Isis, informed us that long life was the reward promised to her votaries. In the museum of the London University is an Egyptian mummy, on which the simple T is represented as planted on the *frustrum* of a cone; this, together with the occasional occurrence of the symbol springing from a heart, points to the hope of a renewed life hereafter.

The *crux ansata* given into the hand of a person was considered in antiquity as a sign of divine dignity; and when given to a king it typified great and living fame, and final elevation to the region of the gods.† In the East the Kiakra or Tschakra, commonly found in the hands of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, is only a modification of it, and is said to be the oldest sign of majesty in India; and when it decorates the image of Vishnu symbolizes his eternal ever-vigilant dominion of the world, and his devotees attach unlimited virtues to the emblem.‡ When Christian monarchs began to arrogate to themselves what they called the divine right of kings, the same right was adopted as one of the chief symbols of sovereignty. At first the circle alone represented their ambitious pretensions, and afterward the cross was associated with the circle to denote the union of both spheres and the authority for their claims. In modern times, it is true, the cross surmounted the circle or globe, as held in the hand of the potentate; but, after all, it is only the old sign with the relative position of its members reversed. Attempts have been made to resolve this frequently occurring sign into an altar and sacrifice; but the facts given above, which show the circle to have sometimes served as a handle, clearly disprove the theory. However, it is also plain that the circle was not simply a handle, but an integral part of the symbol, from the fact of the emblem being some-

* John Newton, M. R. C. S., in his Essay appended to Inman's "Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism," p. 109.

† Zöckler: *Das Kreuz Christi*, p. 9.

‡ "Edinburgh Review," p. 232.

times divided, and the parts held in the separate hands of worshipers or priests.

That notable extremist in all that pertains to symbolism, Dr. Thomas Inman, would reduce the *crux ansata*, as well as every other sign in heaven and earth which has ever served as a symbol, to a *phallic* significance and origin.*

It is evident that the cross in its narrowest use was an emblem of life, and of generation as a means of life; but it is by no means plain that the symbol whose significance reached forward to the spiritual awakening of a dead world again to life, arose from any such source as the doctor has assigned it. Various modifications of the *crux ansata* appear in different countries of the Old World as well as in the New. In Asia Minor it is found in precisely the same proportions and under the same circumstances as in Egypt.

Again, the Assyrian Venus, Istar, stands upon a lion, and holds a cross in her left hand. A variation of the symbol, in which the roundlet is much enlarged and the rectangular bars are equal in length, is found in the sign of the Babylonian and Assyrian Istar, the Phenician Astarte, and has come in later times to represent the planet Venus.† This was evidently always an astronomical sign, and had no religious significance. The identity of the handle cross as found among the people of the Euphrates, and the Phenicians with that of the Egyptians, has been clearly proved, and there is no doubt that

* See Dr. Inman's "Certain Ancient Faiths, which have been Embodied in Ancient Names." 2 vols., 8vo. London: Trübner & Co. Also "Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism." 8vo. London, 1874. The latter is only a chapter from the larger work, and as it bears more directly upon the subject in hand than "Ancient Faiths," we make our references from it. (See on *Crux Ansata*, pp. 9, 15, 35, 37, 44, 45, 53, 64, 102, 103.) The author, so far as he touches Christianity, is an unsparing iconoclast. There is no symbol in all the range of religion or mythology, whether Israelitish or pagan, Christian or Hindu, but what, in his opinion, originated in the grossest and, to us, most disgusting sensualism. With a seeming delight in his theory, he resolves, with the greatest clearness to himself, one symbol after another back to a phallic origin. The rationalistic sentiments of the author might be more readily excused, and his theory in a measure believed, if he did not always speak *ex cathedrâ*, upturning the time-attested interpretation of the best-known symbols, without condescending to assign a reason or cite a parallelism from which to draw his sweeping conclusions.

† See Lajard's *Observations sur l'origine et la signification du symbole appelé la croix ansée.* Paris, 1847.

its narrowest significance was "Life," * with a deeper meaning which anticipated the continuation of that life through eternity.† To this day it has the same significance in India. In Egypt it was known popularly as the "emblem of life," and the Swastika or holy Tau of the Buddhists is well known to be designated by the same appellation. ‡

De Zöckler, in his work previously cited, and Brugsch, in his "Grammar of the Hieroglyphics," § call attention to still another Egyptian form of cross to which religious significance in their opinion can be attached. This cross, known as the *Nile-measure*, consists of a perpendicular staff with four bars crossing it at right angles. The explanation of its meaning, as given by the above authors, is that the bars are symbolic of the elements, and of steps or degrees in the spiritual life, neither of which are plausible or satisfactory. The probabilities are that its name, (Νειλομέτριον or Νειλοσχοπεῖον,) Nile-measure, may have at least indicated its significance, if not its use. The bars may have represented certain stages of the river's rise and fall.

The Maltese cross, with its four delta-like arms, was discovered on the island from which it takes its name, and was metamorphosed from a gross and sensual representation into its present form by the virtuous knights of St. John, who adopted it for their coat of arms. ‖ As found it was evidently the work of Phenician colonists, and was mistaken by a credulous priesthood for a marvelous revelation from the hands of divinity. The study of Assyrian antiquities has, however, revealed its meaning, as it was understood in its most primitive use. It originally typified the elysium of the four great gods of the Assyrian pantheon, namely, Ra; the first triad, Anu, Belus, and Hea; and when inserted in a roundlet, as may be

* Zöckler: *Das Kreuz Christi*, p. 12.

† See especially M. Oppert's *L'immortalitè de l'âme chez les Chaldéens*," first published in the *Annales de Philosophie Chretienne* for 1874, and issued separately Paris, 1875. This translation of an ancient Assyrian text describes the descent of Istar, the Chaldean Astarte, to the abodes of the dead, and the great difficulty of her escape. The discovery of this document proves beyond a doubt that the belief of the continued life of the soul after death prevailed among the Assyrians.

‡ "Edinburgh Review," p. 233.

§ H. Brugsch: *Hieroglyphischen Grammatik*. Leipzig, 1872.

‖ For an explanation as to its origin, etc., consult "Edinburgh Review," p. 234, and Inman's "Ancient Pagan Symbolism," pp. 41, 42.

seen in the colossal tablet from Nimroud, deposited in the British Museum, it signifies Sansi, or the sun, ruling the earth as well as the heavens.* This cross, the symbol of royalty and dominion, was hung upon the breasts of kings,† as may be seen on the Nineveh remains. With this meaning it was worn on the official garments of the Etruscan priesthood. The usual appearance of the cross on monuments, with its arms corresponding with the cardinal points, indicates that it was a symbol of the life-giving power of the sun.‡ Here again we find the symbol associated with the idea of life. The Maltese cross has been found in Asia Minor, Cyprus, and Sicily; and Schlieman has discovered a number of representations of it, with other crosses, on vases, which he has dug from what he supposes to be the seat of ancient Troy. §

One of the most notable types of cross, and one which has figured in the religious symbolism of more peoples than any other, is that which is popularly and erroneously known as "Thor's hammer," or "Thor's battle-ax."

This popular emblem, which for thousands of years (and perhaps almost as much now as ever) has been the distinguishing sign of deified heroes, may be best described as a *cruciform hammer*. It received its name from being borne in the hand of Thor, as the all-powerful instrument by means of which his marvelous deeds recorded in the Eddas were accomplished. It was venerated by the heroes of the North as the magical sign which thwarted the power of death over those who bore it; and the Scandinavian devotee placed it upon his horn of mead before raising it to his lips, no doubt for the purpose of imparting to it life-giving virtues. It was also adopted at an early day by all the potentates of the North as a symbol of power. By a stretch of imagination, for which we have been unable to find any authority, the writer in the "Edinburgh Review" ‖ informs us that it was "that mark which the prophet was com-

* "Edinburgh Review," p. 234, and Zöckler: *Das Kreuz Christi*, p. 13.

† Layard's "Mon. of Niu.," pl. lix; and again on xli the same form is used for ear-rings.

‡ Micalis: *Antichi Monumenti*, pl. xxix. Also note some additional instances of the occurrence of Maltese crosses near Pau, in the Basses-Pyrénées, mentioned in "Edinburgh Review," p. 235.

§ Zöckler: "Op. Cit." p. 13.

‖ "Edinburgh Review," p. 237. Jan., 1870.

manded to impress upon the foreheads of the faithful in Judah." Ezek. ix, 4.

As to its name, the popular designation of the symbol is evidently a misnomer, since its origin dates back centuries before the mythology of the North was developed. In India it was known as the *swastika* of the Buddhists, and served as the monograms of Vishnu and Siva. Such are its associations and uses at the present day, and, no doubt, they have been the same from the very advent of the religions of these respective deities. The inquirer has, however, not even here measured the limit of its antiquity, for in China it was known long before the Sakya-Buddha era as the Leo-tseu, and was portrayed upon the walls of their pagodas, and upon the lanterns used to illumine their most sacred precincts. It has ever been the symbol of their heaven.* In the great temple of Rameses II, at Thebes, it is represented frequently with such associations as conclusively prove that its significance was the same in the land of the Nile as in China. All over the East it is the magic symbol of the Buddhist heaven; "the chief ornament on the scepters and crowns of the Bompa deities of Thibet, who dispute the palm of antiquity with all other divinities; and is beautifully pressed in the Artee, or musical bell, borne by the figure of Balgovina, the herald or messenger of heaven.† The universality of the use of this symbol is proven by its prevalence as well in Europe as in Asia and Africa. Among the Etruscans it was used as a religious sign, as is shown by its appearance on urns exhumed from ancient lake-beds situated between Parma and Pacenza. Those taken from the lacustrine cemeteries are thought to date back to 1000 B. C. On the *terra cotta* vases of Alba Longa the same sign is impressed, and served as the symbol of Persephone, the awful queen of the shades, the "arbiter of mortal fate,"‡ while on the roll of the Roman soldiery it was the sign of life. On the old Runic monuments of Scandinavia it is ever present.§ Even in Scotland it is found on sculptured stones

* Consult especially Zöckler's *Das Kruz Christi*, and the source cited by him, page 17. Also the treatment of the subject by the "Edinburgh Review" is admirable, and to it we express our indebtedness.

† "Edinburgh Review," p. 238.

‡ Millin's *Galerie Mythologique*, pl. cxxxi and cxliv.

§ See Stephens: "The Old Northern Runic Monuments." Pp. 674, 752. London, 1860.

of unknown age.* The most numerous examples of this form of cross are, however, preserved in the sculptures from Khorsabad and the ivories from Nimroud. In all we see heaven and the hope of the future life typified. For the reader who may wish to look at another side of the subject we cite Dr. Inman, who attempts to find for the cross *pattée*, or Thor's hammer, the same origin to which he assigns every other symbol.†

In this connection we might cite the occurrence of many different forms of the cross in various parts of Europe. A couple especially are prominent and of interest. On a coin of the ancient city of Asido, in South Spain, the cross, with arms of equal length, is found with an upturned crescent below it.‡ Another cross which has attracted much attention is found hewn in a rock near Halle, with plants and weapons beside it, and is said by antiquarians to belong to a period long anterior to the Christianization of Germany.§

The pre-Christian crosses of Rome are evidently of Egyptian origin. Probably the most ancient known crosses are two of hewn stone, discovered a few years ago in the wilds of Central India by a Mr. Mulheran, C. E. These granite monoliths are in perfect condition, and amid surroundings which indicate that once, in a primeval age, instead of the ancient and interminable forests which now cover this region, agriculture and the domestic arts were there carried to a reasonable degree of perfection. The larger of these crosses stands ten feet nine inches, and the smaller eight feet six inches above the ground. This mountain district has long been uninhabited, and the learned writer in the "Edinburgh Review," who cites these remains, estimates their origin as dating 3,000 years B. C.

A most interesting divergence from the subject in hand would be the consideration of the significance of the cross as it appears in the plans and architectural proportions of ancient tumuli, pyramids, and temples. It is a question whether the cross in these connections had any significance other than so

* See a work on the subject published by Dr. Stuart under the auspices of the Spaulding Club.

† Inman's "Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism," p. 44.

‡ See J. Zöbel de Zangroniz, in *der Zeitschr. der deutschen Morganl. Gesellschaft.* Bd. 17, (1863,) sec. 337. Also, Zöckler's *Das Kreuz Christi*, p. 27.

§ See F. de Rougemont, *die Bronzezeit oder die Semiten im Occident, deutsch Ausg. von C. Aug. Keerl.* 1869. S. 410 f.—Zöckler, "Op. Cit.," p. 29.

far as it served as a convenient basis for the form of a structure. Though many modern churches are built in the form of a cross, in honor of the distinguishing symbol of Christianity, it is quite plain that there are great numbers of modern cruciform edifices whose forms have no symbolic meaning, or even a reference, to any religious idea. The writer above alluded to has made a number of interesting references to cruciform structures in antiquity, chief among them the great temple of *Bindi Madhu*, formerly situated in the ancient city of Benares, on the banks of the Ganges, but demolished in the seventeenth century by the Emperor Aurungzebe.* However, the author has only been able to excite curiosity of a nature which would seem to draw attention from the well-known symbolism of the cross to almost an entirely different subject, without adding anything to its elucidation. For those who are interested in the colossal cruciform architecture of India we beg leave to cite Maurice's "Indian Antiquities," where such monuments of the labor of generations as the subterranean temple at Elephanta and the temple of Chillambrum are described. Even more remote from the subject in hand is that species of argument which would attempt to find the cross represented in the well-known "grove" or "mystic palm-tree" of Eastern nations. Dr. Zöckler furnishes an illustration of this Babylonian and Assyrian tree, with its three pairs of branches and its crowning tuft of palm-leaves, to which he adds the opinion that this symbol had, no doubt, reference to the tree of life.† A coffin found in Warka, the ancient Erech, (Gen. x, 10,) bears the sign upon it, and it is thought to typify the life to come.‡

The writer in the "Edinburgh Review" cites numerous instances of the association of the tree with the cross, and uses all his argument to prove that the idea of the cross in antiquity originated with the tree of life in the garden of Eden. It would have been difficult to have framed a more improbable theory. No doubt the complex representations of a tree found among the Assyrians, the Buddhists, and the Egyptians, and as-

* Described in *Voyage de Tavernier*, tom. iv, p. 149, edit. à Rouen.

† See *Das Kreuz Christi*, p. 14.

‡ See Layard's "Nineveh," fig. 338 and text thereto, pp. 342, 410, 426. Also Piper's *Der Baum des Lebens*, in *Evangel Kalender*, 1863, p. 23. The coffin referred to is deposited in the British Museum.

sociated by them always with their worship, may indicate the vestige of a clearer knowledge of the tree of life once possessed by the ancestors of those peoples; but what connection there is between this representation of the tree of life and the simple figures of the cross which we have cited, we are unable to discover.*

The astonishment of the discoverers and conquerors of the New World can hardly be appreciated, when, upon their arrival in the land of wonders, they observed the most marked resemblances between Christian usage and worship and that of the Mexicans.† Besides the observance of ceremonies resembling the eucharist, to their surprise and bewilderment, they found the cross in its accepted form erected in the temples of Anahuac. How the sacred emblem, which they supposed to be peculiar alone to the faith of which they were the champions, could have reached this remote and unknown land, became a fruitful subject for their speculations, and in fact for many others more learned than they in later times. Two views, in themselves perplexing, were adopted as a solution of the problem. The first, that the Apostle Thomas had preached Christianity to the inhabitants of the New World, was confidently believed by some, and the inventive faculty of the priesthood was not long wanting in the discovery of a tradition confirming the opinion.‡

St. Columba was also credited with similar missionary labors.§ The second view, which seems to have been largely shared by the invaders and their historians, was that these resemblances to the practices and symbolism of the true faith were but devices of the Evil One to lead away the wretched people who accepted them. De Solis thinks there is nothing improbable in the fact "that the malignant influence, so frequently noticed in sacred history, should be found equally in profane." ‖

Herrera indulges in the same superstition with reference to

* See Inman's "Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism," pp. 22, 49, 50, 70, 91, 100; and Mr. Newton's Essay in the Appendix is worthy of a reading.

† See Prescott's "Appendix to Conquest of Mexico," part i.

‡ See Kingsborough's "Mexican Antiquities," vol. vi, p. 332. London, 1830–48. Also, see Veytia's *Historia Antiqua de Mejico*, lib. i, cap. xv. Mexico, 1836. Also the same, lib. i, cap. xix; and Dr. Mier's "Dissertation on Sahagun," lib. iii supplement.

§ See Kingsborough's "Mex. Ant.," vol. iv, p. 285.

‖ Antonio de Solis: *Hist. de la Conquista*, lib. ii, cap. iv. Madrid, 1684.

the diabolical imitations of the Israelitish exodus; * and Lord Kingsborough, with strange bias, furnishes us the unusual anomaly of the union of great learning with over credulity.† The number of crosses of various forms and materials which met their eyes in all parts of the newly-discovered land furnished them with repeated surprises.‡ In the court of the temple of Cozumel, off the coast of Yucatan, Cortez discovered a cross which he describes as about ten palms high, and made of stone and lime. Mr. Stephens, however, in his "Incidents of Travel in Yucatan,"§ in commenting on the so-called "Cozumel cross" preserved at Merida, and which is claimed to be the identical one alluded to by Cortez, expresses some doubts as to whether the cross was ever really an object of worship among the natives. To the able refutation of this statement, found in Mr. Prescott's Appendix, there may be added many conclusive proofs that Mr. Stephens's opinion was illy founded. Even at the present day a cross may be seen sculptured in bas-relief on the wall of one of the buildings of the Palenque, while the figure of a child is held up before it in adoration.‖ Every temple, chapel, pyramidal summit, and subterranean sanctuary was adorned with it, while the vestments of the priests, who performed sacrificial duties in the presence of their gods, were figured all over with it. Sepulchers and tombs were graven with the wondrous symbol, while its form in many instances served as the plan for subterranean temples.

In Ojaaca, in Central America, we find a marvelous illustration of this style of cruciform structure in the great temple at Mitzla, "the city of the moon," hewn in the living rock by the stupendous labor of no mean artisans. Still, if the form of the cross existed only in the plan of architectural structures, it would not be worth while to attach much importance to its presence. No wonder that the Christian knight, full of

* Herrera: *Hist. General*, dec. iii, lib. iii, cap. x. Madrid, 1730.

† "Mex. Antiq," tom. vi, pp. 282–410.

‡ For the references on this subject consult the Spanish writers cited in note at the beginning of the article.

§ New York, 1843, vol. ii, chap. xx.

‖ See Prescott: "Hist. Conquest of Mex." Appendix, part i. Also Herrera: *Hist. General*, dec. ii, lib. iii, cap. i. Also Gomera: *Chronica de la Nuevo Espana*, cap. xv, ap. Barcia, tom. ii.

enthusiasm over his rich conquest, and with a vision incapable of seeing any thing in its true light, (because of the enchanting tales of Marco Polo, which he had imbibed,) should be ready to see in the wonderful *Quelzalcoatl* of the Mexicans the white man, with a long beard, who came from the East and disappeared again, the visit of St. Thomas, or some other saintly personage, whose religion was symbolized in the cross of Christ.* The whole narrative of their adventures and impressions, as given by the Spanish historians, seems surrounded with the enchantment of an Arabian tale. In Mexico the cross, in the majority of instances, was the symbol of the goddess of rain, and annual ceremonies were conducted in her honor; it, as her characteristic emblem, occupied a prominent place. In both North and South America the cross was dedicated to her. In the spring time, when the Mexican wished to conciliate *Centeotl*, the goddess of corn, the daughter of heaven, with blind and barbarous superstition he nailed a young man or maiden to the cross, and after awhile dispatched the miserable victim with an arrow from his bow. The Muyscas, of the northern part of South America, naturally of a milder disposition, instead of resorting to such barbarous measures, were in the habit of stretching two ropes at right angles across the surface of a quiet lake or placid pool in a stream, and at the point of intersection of these gigantic arms, the oblation of precious gems, and food, and oils, were cast into the tranquil water.† Every-where in those portions of the New World which were occupied by the civilized races which inhabited it before the Red Indians, the fruitful power of nature in earth and air, and especially *rain*, was worshiped through the sign of the cross. Brinton, while stating that the arms of the cross, pointing to the cardinal quarters, represent the "rain bringers," ventures pretty far when he adds that the tombs of the Mexicans were built cruciform, as symbolic of the resurrection and future life, because the buried body would rise by the power of the four spirits of the world, as the buried seed takes on a new existence when watered with the

* For a good account of Quelzalcoatl, see Prescott's "Mexico," vol. i, Book i, chap. iii.

† See especially "Edinburgh Review," p. 233; Müller's *Geschichte der Amerikanischen Urreligionen*, pp. 371–499. Squier's "Serpent Symbol in America," (1869,) p. 98; and Brinton's "Myths of the New World," pp. 95-97.

vernal showers. If such was their illustration of the resurrection, we would not be surprised if some enthusiast should go a step farther than the Spanish conquerors, and conclude that St. Paul, as well as St. Thomas, had preached the Gospel in the New World. A superstitious reverence was attached to the cross among the various peoples of North and South America, such as could only be rivaled by the bigoted invaders of their lands and homes. As an illustration of the belief in the miraculous power of the symbol, it was common to lay wooden and miniature stone crosses on new-born babes, in order to drive away evil spirits.* Representations of the cross, in connection with sacrifices, are plainly delineated on Mexican basreliefs and manuscripts.

A Mr. Fejérvary, in Hungary, possesses a Mexican manuscript, on the last leaf of which is a simple Tau cross, bearing a sacrifice, and before it stands what appears to be a bloody god.† The coincidence which makes the cross of the Mexican an instrument of sacrifice, like the cross of Christ, is strange enough. In America the peculiarity of the use of the Tau cross is that it was exclusively dedicated to the god of rain, or productive force in nature; but the same idea is expressed by its use in the New World as was designed to be symbolized by this sign in the Old.

The worship of the sun once was, no doubt, prevalent in South America, as it was known to be the national religion of the Peruvians. Here, again, the Maltese cross is common, with the same significance as it possessed among the Assyrians. These crosses in most instances are found hewn in the rock, with their arms pointing toward the cardinal quarters. A warrior holding a banner decorated with a large Maltese cross, as depicted on a tablet of gypsum discovered by Captain Du Paix, is described by Baradère in his Antiquities.‡ Many others are found scattered over that large district in South America where Sabean worship prevailed.§

Thor's hammer is likewise of frequent occurrence, especially in Mexico, where it is found carved on walls and the entrances

* Zöckler: *Das Kreuz Christi*, p. 32.

† Zöckler, page 33; and Klemm: *Culturgeschichte*, v, 142.

‡ "Mex. Antiq.," pl. xxix. (*Prém. Expéd.*)

§ "Edinburgh Review," p. 235.

of temples.* In the year 1839 a Dr. Lund discovered, near Bahia, in Brazil, what he supposed to be a runic stone table on which the image of Thor was engraven. On this also was a quite perfect cross of the Thor's-hammer class. Dr. Zöckler, on quoting this fact, falls in with the extravagant theories of a few foreign writers on America, who claim that the Scandinavians spread their civilization all over the New World. We are willing to accept the claims made for the Northmen, so far as there are documents to back them, (and that there are such we do not doubt,) but no further.†. While the treatment of this subject by Dr. Zöckler is altogether commendable, yet in this particular department we are forced to the conclusion that he is a better theologian than an American antiquarian.

Such are the facts in as compressed a form as it is possible for us to present them without wearying the reader unduly on this at best a perplexing subject. The origin of this symbolism, so fraught with deepest interest, as yet is unexplained, and, we fear, is inexplicable. How a simple sign should be made the arbitrary representative of the same idea the world over among people separated by seas and mountains, and strangers to each other in point of language and customs, without any great fact or event associating itself with that sign from which it might derive its meaning, must ever be a marvel before the eyes of the world. All round the globe we find one common attempt at representing the idea of life present and life to come under the simple figure of the cross.

We believe we are not putting too strong a construction on the facts when we say that it furnishes an exhibition of the great struggle of the race after God and that which is immortal. This conclusion reached, the most interesting question connected with the subject yet remains unanswered, namely: Was it merely a coincidence which assigned to the cross the same symbolic significance in paganism and in Christianity? That it should embody the living hope of pagans three thousand years before Christ, and of all the world at the present day, after a lapse of nearly five thousand years, is strange enough.

Opinion has ranged widely on this subject; some have held that the cross was an object of revelation, while others have

* Kingsborough's "Mex. Antiq.," tom. iv.

† Rafn: *Antiquitates Americanæ.* Fol. Hafniæ, 1837.

gone to the other extreme of declaring its adoption by so many peoples for the same purpose to be purely accidental. This we must leave as an open question for the decision of the reader.

It suffices for the present to reflect upon the fact that the cross is no longer the sign of an uncertain hope entertained by the pagan devotee, but is, and ever will be, the matchless symbol of a hope which enables us to furnish a reason for the faith that is within us.

Art. III.—RELATIONS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH TO THE CAUSE OF TEMPERANCE.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Nathan Bangs, D.D.
History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By Abel Stevens, LL.D.
Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1796 *to* 1872
History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Robert Emory, D.D., (1773 to 1856 inclusive.)

The magnitude of the evil of intemperance is becoming better understood by all classes of society, and its desolating ravages are mourned over by the sober and religious community as never before. Those engaged in the ruinous traffic have grown more bold, and seek to promote their nefarious designs by organization; while the friends of temperance have become heroic and sublime in their labors for the suppression of the evil. The battle is waxing hotter and hotter, and the contestants include all ranks and conditions of mankind. In this hotly-contested battle of right against wrong no branch of the Church of Christ can stand aloof as a disinterested spectator. It is the cause of humanity, and the cause of humanity is the cause of God.

The position taken by the Church of Christ upon this question is most important. A false or equivocal position must inevitably retard the good work; a true and unwavering stand will accelerate it and hasten its final success. In the future, when the battle has been fought and won, the position taken by any branch of the Church of Christ will become historic, and will be a matter of congratulation or regret. The ground occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Church is well understood, its fundamental law requiring each individual member

to abstain from "drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity." The temperance idea is, therefore, incorporated in our organic law, and the Church is one great temperance society, with well-defined principles and purposes. To trace the development of this idea, and to show the position of our Church upon this question, is the object of the present writing.

The General Rules, from which the foregoing quotation is made, were formulated by John and Charles Wesley in 1743. Wesley found drunkenness a prevalent evil in his day, and the ravages of the liquor fiend excited his commiseration for the sufferings, and stimulated his zeal for the salvation, of men. Methodists were expected to avoid "evil of every kind, but especially that most generally practiced," among which drunkenness has always been found. The rule on this subject has several times been changed, as follows:—

1743. Mr. Wesley's original rule: "Drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity."

1789. "Drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them."

1790. "Drunkenness, or drinking spirituous liquors, unless in cases of necessity."

1791. "Drunkenness, or drinking spirituous liquors, unless in cases of necessity."

1848. Mr. Wesley's rule restored as in 1743.

The General Rules have become a part of the constitutional law of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which every member has subscribed, and by which they are governed. Under this law the Church, in its legislative body, has sought to give expression to its views, and efficiency to the law, in various ways. It was not to be expected that a rule or law so at variance with the common customs of the age would remain unviolated. There were then, as now, some who were regardless of Church vows, and held law in abeyance when goaded on in an evil course by appetite or gain. But the fathers thought the offenders should be dealt with, and the law be vindicated. As early as 1780 we find Conference action recorded. At that time the struggle for national independence was progressing, and for years the colonies had been engaged

in war. Religious privileges had been few, and spiritual prosperity had been retarded. Church laws had been thrown aside, or trampled under foot. Asbury came forth from his retirement, whither he had been driven by the war, and presided at this Conference. It was found that Methodists had suffered in the general defection from the ways of God, and were engaged in the distillation of spirituous liquors. In relation to this the following was adopted:—

"*Quest.* Do we disapprove of the practice of distilling grain into liquor? Shall we disown our friends who will not renounce the practice?

"*Ans.* Yes."

This law had special reference to distilling, and nothing was said about drinking. But three years later higher ground was taken, and the following was added to the Conference Minutes:

"*Quest.* Should our friends be permitted to make spirituous liquors, sell, and drink them in drams?

"*Ans.* By no means: we think it wrong in its nature and consequences, and desire all our preachers to teach the people by precept and example to put away this evil."

This was strong ground to be taken, considering the prevalence of the evil, for in that day it pervaded all classes of society. Seasons of festivity and sorrow, of labor and relaxation, and sometimes even of religious solemnity, were characterized by the free use of intoxicating drinks. Although in all ages drunkenness has been condemned as a vice, the Methodist Church was the first Christian Church since the apostles which forbade the use of spirituous liquors as a beverage, and their sale for such purposes. The action of the Conference mentioned above was thirty years earlier than the organization of any temperance society. The men composing that Conference were brave and good men, pioneers in a good cause, ready to carry out the law as left by Wesley.

In the three years from 1780 to 1783 there was evidently a growth in the temperance sentiment. In the first-named year the distillation of ardent spirits was denounced, and all Methodists engaged in the base work were to be disowned. It was pandering too much to the vices of the times. It is likely that as some Methodists were engaged in the manufacture of spirituous liquors, many more were habitual drinkers

There is an intimation that the preachers were not all free from it. Mention is made of the same state of things in the Large Minutes. The evil of dram drinking and snuff taking was found to some extent, even among those who met in band. These bands were supposed to include the most devoted and circumspect, but they were living in violation of the rules of the Church. Their condition is sho wnby the following minute :—

"*Quest.* Have those in band left off snuff and drams?

"*Ans.* No. Many are still enslaved to one or the other. In order to redress this, 1. Let no preacher touch either on any account. 2. Strongly dissuade our people from them. 3. Answer their pretenses, particularly curing the colic."

Our fathers were engaged in a hard fight. They were battling an insidious foe. It is evident the early dram-drinking Methodists were not slow in finding pretenses for their evil habits. We think the preachers assigned themselves a hard task to answer the pretenses of moderate drinkers. The "colic," and kindred diseases requiring oft-repeated doses of ardent spirits, are stubborn ailments, and will not readily yield to medical treatment, and the subjects of them are in constant fear of a return of the malady, and so think it best to use the medicine as a preventive as well as a cure. Alas for the weakness of human nature! The preachers also were specially reminded of their duty of total abstinence in the following:—

"*Quest.* May our ministers or traveling preachers drink spirituous liquors?

"*Ans.* By no means, unless it be medicinally."

They were also enjoined to preach expressly against dram drinking. The leaders were to "closely examine and exhort every person to put away the accursed thing." The preacher was to "warn every Society that none who is guilty herein can remain among us;" and he was to "vigorously, but calmly, enforce the rule concerning drams." And on the reception of a new helper the question was proposed, "Do you take no drams?"

It has been seen that the original rule of Mr. Wesley was changed in 1789, leaving out the phrase "unless in cases of extreme necessity," thus prohibiting *all* use of spirituous liquors as a drink, and even forbidding *buying or selling* them under any circumstances. In 1790 the rule was again changed, and in a

great measure robbed of its significance and glory, by leaving out the phrase *buying or selling.* This was probably the greatest mistake ever made on this subject by the Methodist Episcopal Church. It compromised the Church, and did an incalculable amount of injury. Within six years of this time the pernicious custom of retailing spirituous liquors by members of the Church had become so offensive as to require a special enactment of the General Conference to check the unhallowed practice; to check, but not prohibit, for when people begin to make laws with a view to regulate an existing evil, it is an evidence that the evil itself is in some sense sanctioned.

To regulate this evil the General Conference of 1796 added a new section to the Discipline: "Of the Sale and Use of Spirituous Liquors." It is in itself something of a curiosity. "If any member of our Society retail or give spirituous liquors, and any thing disorderly be transacted under his roof on this account, the preacher who has the oversight of the circuit shall proceed against him, as in the case of other immoralities: and the person accused shall be cleared, censured, suspended, or excluded, according to his conduct, as on other charges of immorality." This was a sort of an ecclesiastical-civil damage law, punishing a man for the evil consequences of the selling or giving, while it tolerated the acts themselves. At this time the bishops (Coke and Asbury) were requested by the Conference to prepare notes explanatory of the Discipline. They did so, and the notes were bound up with the form of Discipline. Explanatory of the above section we find the following note:—

N. B. Far be it from us to wish or endeavor to intrude upon the proper religious or civil liberty of any of our people. But the retailing of spirituous liquors, and giving drams to customers when they call at the stores, are such prevalent customs at present, and are productive of so many evils, that we judge it our indispensable duty to form a regulation against them. The cause of God, which we prefer to every other consideration under heaven, absolutely requires us to step forth with humble boldness in this respect.

This objectionable section was omitted from the Discipline in 1840.

The administrators of discipline were evidently perplexed by the change of the General Rule, because under it, in its changed form, those who trafficked in spirituous liquors could

be dealt with, only under the more general and equivocal rule of "doing no harm."

There were but slight changes in the law for many years after this. In 1820 we get a glimpse of the matter in the "Bishops' Address to the General Conference," which, on this point, was referred to a committee, with instructions to report. The report was made, but was laid upon the table. The following, however, was added to the Discipline: "No preacher among us shall distill or retail spirituous liquors without forfeiting his official standing." The law itself is a sad comment upon the practices of the times. There were diverse views in regard to this, and a motion was made to strike it out; but the motion was lost. It was then moved "that no member in our Church shall distill ardent spirits without forfeiting his standing." This, though a just and consistent measure, was killed by indefinite postponement. From 1790 to 1828 there was great laxity on the part of the administrators of Discipline, and the tendency of the Church was to recede from the original position of Mr. Wesley. The rule itself had been softened down, and in many instances even this had been suffered to remain as a dead letter. The American Temperance Society commenced its operations in 1826, and did a vast amount of good. A proposition was made to our Church that it should unite with that society, but the terms were such as the Church did not think it expedient to accept. The proposition gave rise to a controversy, and to some bitterness and heart-burnings on both sides of the question. The discussion elicited some facts that had long been concealed. It was clearly discovered that members of our own Church were in the daily habit of using intoxicating liquors, and that the Discipline, at best, had been but partially enforced. This discovery led to important results. It showed the necessity of a reformation even in our own Church, notwithstanding the prohibitory rule. Temperance societies were formed, and many of the preachers and people fell in with the temperance measures, greatly to the benefit of the Church and to the cause of God generally.

The General Conference of 1828 adopted a report on the subject, prepared by Wilbur Fisk. It speaks of the example of the fathers both in Europe and America, and of our excellent rules, as tending to the suppression of intemperance, and

declared it important, in order to advance the cause, that we neither drink ourselves, (except medicinally,) nor give it to visitors or workmen.

In 1832, on motion of S. G. Roszel, a committee of seven was appointed, denominated "The Committee on Temperance." This was the first committee ever appointed by the General Conference bearing this name, but which has been continued in every General Conference since. Memorials on the subject came in from various parts of the country, showing that the people were becoming alive to the importance of the question. Rev. H. B. Bascom, secretary of the committee, prepared an address, which was read before the Conference and unanimously adopted. It was ordered printed in "The Advocate and Journal," and also in tract form, as a summary expression of the views of that body upon this important question. It was also incorporated in full by Dr. Bangs in his "History of the Methodist Episcopal Church." It is a strong and earnest appeal to the members of our Church to abstain entirely from the use of spirituous liquors. The foundation of this appeal is laid in the Bible, where the foundation of all true efforts in the temperance reform should be laid. Because of the poisonous nature of alcohol, the duty of *total* abstinence is urged with great force as the only line of safety, for the transition from a temperate to an intemperate use of spirituous liquors is almost as certain as it is insensible. "Indeed," says the author, "with us *it is a question of great moral interest whether a man can indulge in their use at all and be considered temperate.*" Of the relations of this subject to the Church he thus speaks:—

> The great and increasing interest, the deep and lasting stake we must always have, as a Church, in preventing and curing the evils of intemperance, will furnish an obvious and commanding vindication of the course we have adopted, in making this appeal to the good sense and enlightened piety of the Methodist Episcopal Church. We consider all intemperance, whether in its incipient or more advanced stages, as an abuse of the physical force and vigor of man, and seriously deducting from the integrity of his mental powers and moral purposes; and we therefore invoke the aid of our people in an attempt to banish the evil from our Church altogether.

The author also fortifies his position, and adds weight to his appeal, by quoting from the father and founder of Methodism.

The terse, concise sentences of Wesley are worthy of transcription here. We wish his burning words may sink deep into the hearts of all men. He says of ardent spirits *in general*:—

"First of all, sacredly abstain from all spirituous liquors; touch them not on any pretense whatever." On their manufacture and sale he remarks, "It is amazing that the preparation or selling of this poison should be permitted, I will not say in any Christian country, but in any civilized State!" He pronounces the gain of the trafficker in ardent spirits "the price of blood," and adds emphatically, "Let not any lover of virtue and truth say one word in favor of this monster. Let no lover of mankind open his mouth to extenuate the guilt of it. Oppose it as you would oppose the devil, whose offspring and likeness it is." Of grocers, in this traffic, he affirms, "They murder mankind by wholesale, and drive them to hell like sheep." He denounces both the manufacture and the sale of spirituous liquors, except for mechanical and medicinal purposes, as a gross immorality; declaring, "None can gain in this way by swallowing up his neighbor's substance, without gaining the damnation of hell!"

In 1836, the law of 1820 declaring that "No preacher among us shall distill or retail spirituous liquors without losing his official standing," was changed so as to apply to "every elder, deacon, or preacher." An effort was also made to restore the original rule of Mr. Wesley. We have already adverted to the evil done by the softening down of this rule. Mr. Bascom, in the address above quoted, expressed an opinion, that the change of the rule by American Methodists, and the substitution of one less unequivocal in its character, since 1790 had been "attended with but little good to *any*, and perhaps with *direct injury* to thousands." But the General Conference was not yet convinced, the delegates had not yet seen enough of the evils of the traffic, and the resolution calling for the restoration resulted in a long and earnest debate. The report of the committee was finally submitted to the bishops, with a request that they give their opinion "whether it interferes with the fourth restrictive regulation in our Discipline." We are not advised that they ever reported. The Conference Journal gives no further account of any action taken. Whether the bishops rendered an opinion on the question referred to them or not, we find, by reference to the General Conference Journal of 1840, that the question of a change of the rule was sub-

mitted to the Annual Conferences. On motion of George Peck, the Committee on Temperance was instructed "to investigate the Journals of the Annual Conferences in order to ascertain the state of the vote upon the restoration of Mr. Wesley's rule on the sale and use of ardent spirits." The constitutional majority was obtained, both in the Annual Conferences and in the General Conference, but the rule was not restored. The debate which occurred in the General Conference of 1844 throws some light upon this matter. Dr. Smith said, "Four years ago they attempted to introduce this rule into the General Rules, but the movement failed. The Annual Conferences would not give their consent; the constitutional authority could not be obtained."

Dr Bangs replied, "It was obtained by a large majority."

Dr. Smith continued, "It was not put in because the report of Dr. Tomlinson maintained that the alteration in the general rule had not been legally recommended."

Just what this technical quibble was we are not advised. Dr. Tomlinson was Chairman of the Committee on Temperance in 1840, and in the report gave his own interpretation of the constitutional restriction. His views were opposed by Dr. Fisk, Winans, and Slicer, and the report was never adopted. In the General Conference the vote on the restoration of the rule stood seventy-six affirmative and thirty-eight negative. The vote first stood seventy-five affirmative, but H. B. Bascom voted after the secretary's count, thus obtaining the required two-thirds majority, if it be understood of those present and voting; but the decision of the bishop was, that as two thirds of the elected members did not vote for it the motion was lost; and, because of the lateness of the hour, the friends of the measure made no appeal from the decision of the Chair. Thus, by a decision of Bishop Andrew contrary to reason and parliamentary usage, this important measure was put beyond possibility of adoption for a long time. This, indeed, was the last item of business done in the Conference of 1840. It immediately adjourned without ordering the question to be submitted to the Annual Conferences, so that five years at least must elapse before it could become a law.

We have already noticed something of the debate on this question in the General Conference of 1844. It ended in the

adoption of a resolution, by a vote of ninety-nine to thirty-three, by which the question of the restoration of Mr. Wesley's rule was submitted to the Annual Conferences. Mr. Early offered a resolution by which he sought to embarrass the measure: "*Resolved*, That it requires two thirds of all the members of the General Conference to alter or recommend a change in the Restrictive Rules." Thus it was sought to confirm the decision of Bishop Andrew, given in 1840. This was ably debated by Dr. Peck, and the resolution was lost by a vote of ayes, fifty; nays, ninety. The matter was now to go once more to the Annual Conferences. At this Conference, however, the Church was divided, and the question was only submitted to the northern Conferences. Perhaps this accounts for the overwhelming majority in support of the measure. The vote in the Annual Conferences stood, for the restoration, two thousand and eleven against twenty-one. The required two-thirds majority was easily obtained in the General Conference of 1848, and it then became a law. The mutilated rule was expunged from the Discipline, and the original rule inserted, as it stands to-day.

This action of the General Conference of 1848 speaks volumes in attestation of the correctness of the views of Mr. Wesley. After an experiment of fifty-eight years, the Church came back to its original starting-point.

We have not been able to ascertain by whose influence or authority the original rule was changed. It was done in the interval between the organization of the Church in 1784, and the first General Conference thereafter held in 1792. Up to that time the business of the Church had been done in the Annual Conferences, but we can find no minute made of the change of the rule. The Restrictive Rules were not adopted until 1808, so that the rule could have been changed without its reference to the Annual Conferences. It was suspected by some that it was done unfairly. In the debate of 1844 Henry Slicer said he suspected the loss of that rule from our Discipline would present a curious history could it be known. Who can estimate the damage done by the change? H. B. Bascom, who was in a position to know as well as any man, said it had been attended by little good to *any*, and perhaps with *direct injury to thousands.*

After this the growth of the temperance idea was more rapid, and we can trace its development in Church action. The subject was presented to the General Conference of 1852 in a short but forcible paragraph in the address of the bishops, recommending decisive action. That portion of the address was referred to a committee, who made a good report, which was adopted. The fact was seen and acknowledged that the temperance reform tended to advance the salvation of men, not only rescuing them from a life of open sin and crime, but that by its influence thousands were brought to Christ. It was also asserted that the Church, in exercising supervision over its membership, did not do its whole duty. She must not remain an indifferent spectator to the struggle going on around her.

Nothing of importance was done in the General Conference of 1856. A report was presented, laid upon the table, and ordered printed. Dr. Slicer made several vain attempts to get it before the Conference; but we cannot find that it was again taken up. Other matters of a more exciting character occupied the time and energies of that body, and temperance had to stand in abeyance.

But the General Conference of 1860 more than atoned for the neglect in the advanced ground taken. In the report adopted some things are especially noteworthy. The responsibility of the Church is unequivocally declared: "We are deeply sensible of the responsibility resting upon the Church for the ultimate triumph of temperance principles. While we appreciate the importance of the proper action of civil authorities, and the use of social influences and instrumentalities, for the extirpation of the vice of intemperance from our land, we utterly despair of the success of any means that may be employed except as the Church maintains a position firm and unequivocal against all complicity with this vice, and at the same time gives her earnest sanction and faithful co-operation to all proper measures for its destruction."

This is the responsibility the Church needs now to feel. The energies of the Church and nation have been expended in close combat with other evils, which, in the providence of God, have been removed. They should now turn attention to the suppression of intemperance. Many temperance advocates in the past have ignored the Church, and scorned her efforts and in-

fluence. But temperance cannot be divorced from the Bible any more than rays of light from the sun. We most firmly believe that the temperance cause cannot advance one iota beyond the position maintained by the Church. We may use legislation and social influence as helps in the work. Some stronghold may be assaulted, and the enemy routed by some sudden dash of the temperance forces; but if not supported by the Church, the enemy will retake the position and shout defiance in the face of the right.

An inconsistency too often overlooked by professing Christians was also condemned. "The renting of buildings for the sale of intoxicating drinks, and the practice of selling grain where it is known to be used for the manufacture of such liquors, is contrary to sound Christian morals, and violating that rule which enjoins on us 'to do no harm and avoid evil of every kind.'" The evil and manifest inconsistency which this condemns is as prevalent now as in 1860; and we must yet labor and wait for the elevation of the moral tone before even the professed followers of Christ will cease to pander to the vice of the times by the renting of buildings and producing those commodities which can have no commercial value aside from the manufacture of alcoholic beverages.

The report also enjoined, "That all ministers having charge of circuits or stations should faithfully enforce the provisions of the Discipline upon this subject, and that every presiding elder should make it a subject of inquiry in every Quarterly Conference."

The report adopted in 1864 was brief. Preachers were recommended to preach specifically upon the subject. Editors were requested to publish such articles as would point out the evil and the cure. Publishers were requested not to advertise under any name any alcoholic drinks. And in all cases the pure juice of the grape was recommended for the Lord's Supper. The first and last resolution of this report were inserted in the Appendix to the Discipline in 1864.

The report adopted in 1868 was more elaborate than its predecessors. It shows how general the vice of intemperance has been in every age of the world, and that the good have waged a constant warfare against it. "Sages of heathenism and saints of the earliest Christian faith bewailed this evil, and

commended the virtue of total abstinence." This enemy now assails all classes of society; and many of the rich, even in our own Church, conform to the evil practices of the world, and "put wine and other dangerous liquors on their table, and, far worse, indulge in their use."

The great men of the nation did not go unreproved, and the shame brought upon the country by this intemperance and drunkenness was deprecated. Joy is expressed at the growth of the temperance sentiment in the laws of the State; and hope that a prohibitory law may soon be enacted by every State, and by the National Congress. The freedmen of the South need it. Our foreign population need it. Our Indian tribes need it. "Our men in authority need it to preserve them from temptations that assail those in high places, and who too often—and even lately in our history—have mantled the face of the people with shame as they have heard how the wine cup and the whisky glass have caused these their national representatives and guardians to become a national dishonor."

There is another point in this report which we wish to quote; which, perhaps, was intended as a guide to the administrators of the Discipline, and also to members who have considered the rule as somewhat ambiguous.

"It has been proposed by several Conferences that the Discipline should be changed so as to read 'intoxicating' instead of spirituous liquors; but we are of the opinion that the change is unnecessary, since all classes of beverages known to the trade as intoxicating, including ale, lager beer, cider, wines, and stronger drinks, are intended to be included under the term 'spirituous liquors,' and should be so considered by the ministers and members of our Church."

Such is the judgment and authoritative declaration of the General Conference of 1868, so that if there be any ambiguity in the language of the rule, there is none in the interpretation of it by the Conference. As a matter of curiosity, and as indicative of the views of the fathers upon this point, we will quote a paragraph from the Large Minutes: "After preaching, take a little lemonade, mild ale, or candied orange peel. All spirituous liquors, at that time especially, are deadly poison. Whether the preachers, thus advised, were afflicted with sore throat or other ailments peculiar to the profession we do not

know, but the distinction made between ale and spirituous liquors shows the former was not included in the latter, in the estimation of the fathers.

The fifth and sixth resolutions of this report were also put into the Appendix to the Discipline: the fifth allowed an Annual Conference, when it deemed best, to employ a preacher who should devote himself exclusively to this reform; the sixth recommended all our ministers to preach on temperance on the fourth Sabbath in June each year, and to use their influence to secure a temperance celebration of the Fourth of July by the Sabbath-schools and other associations.

The report adopted by the General Conference of 1872 is a restatement of the position taken by the Church in the past, and an earnest and hearty indorsement of the doctrine of total prohibition; and as tending toward that end, it cordially accepts and approves those laws which hold the liquor system; responsible for the woes and losses it inflicts upon the people. All the resolutions in this report, being five in number, were inserted in the Appendix to the Discipline of 1872, and all others were omitted. We can hardly consider this an advance. We do not know but it is a retrograde movement in one particular at least, that we are no longer enjoined or recommended to preach upon the subject; but the resolutions are strong, and worthy the consideration of the Church.

Such is the past action and position of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the question of temperance. It is a record on account of which she has no cause to blush. Our laws have not always been unequivocal, our practices have not always come up to the requirements of our laws; but the aim of the Church has always been toward total abstinence in the individual and total prohibition in the State. Her law-making body has always recognized the evil and attempted a cure. Her pulpit has denounced the liquor traffic, and offered a helping hand to its victims. The pens, the influence of brain and heart, of many of her best men and women, have been employed to promote the principles of temperance; and to-day the cause has no truer friends or more earnest advocates than are found within her pale.

But what of the future? Progress is the watch-word of the Church of Christ. In the present aspect of the reform there

is no question more important than its relation to the Church. The late demonstrations in the Woman's Crusade show how closely it is allied to the religious convictions of the people. The report of the General Conference of 1872 struck the right key in this particular. It says, "Believing, as we do, the Church of Christ represents and embodies the only true principles of individual and national reform, it is our settled conviction that we must rely mainly for the success of the temperance cause on her leadership and co-operation." This, no doubt, is correct. Temperance cannot advance beyond the position of the Church; neither can the cause become permanent and strong unless it is adopted by the Church as a part of herself. The ministry must not be silent nor give an uncertain sound. They must be leaders in this as in every other moral reform. There is before us, as a Church, a glorious and extended field of usefulness in the cause of temperance which we should not fail to enter. This interest should not be left to promiscuous, spasmodic, and uncertain effort, with here and there an individual pastor or layman toiling in the field; but there should be one general advance, by the whole Church, all along the line of our militant host. Why may not our Church by law organize her entire body of one million five hundred thousand members for earnest and aggressive work in the temperance field?

We are, as a Church, a temperance body, but the fact is scarcely recognized. We have Sunday-school, Tract, and other societies, organized for special work; why may we not have a Temperance Society under the supervision of the General Conference, with its Annual Conference auxiliaries, and its secretary traveling through, and inspiring the societies with new life and zeal in the cause? And, under his direction, the press could be used as an element of power. We have our peculiar methods of labor, and by those methods we prefer to do our share of work. As a Church we cannot well labor in connection with the National Temperance Society in any organized form. An effort was made in 1829 to unite the Church with the American Temperance Society, which signally failed. In the General Conference of 1872 a resolution was offered looking to a sort of joint labor with the National Temperance Society, recommending its publications to our Sunday-schools,

and the taking of collections and contributions for its treasury. It was referred to the Committee on Temperance, but evidently found no favor.

Such a society as we have named, formed upon the basis of the general rule forbidding "Drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity," would have many and great advantages. It would make a more permanent temperance organization than has ever been effected. The great drawback to the temperance reform has been its instability. Societies, both open and secret, have been organized, have flourished, declined, and died, all over the land. It will be so again, no doubt. Incorporate it with the Church, not as a matter foreign to her purpose and nature, but as a part of herself, and it will abide in strength, grow with her growth, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The Church would then feel a responsibility which now she does not feel. This cause is now in a great measure cast off by the Church, and is thrown upon outside organizations and political parties, which are as treacherous as the quicksands and as unreliable as the wind. The cause would then have the co-operative sympathy of the Church. Every preacher would be a temperance leader and advocate. This would strengthen it every-where. What a new impetus would be given it! But now, grand as it is in conception, noble in its purposes, and beneficent in its results, it goes begging for sympathy and co-operation among the Churches of the land. All acknowledge its relation to religion, yet none will adopt it as one of their own family. By union with the Church its purposes would be better defined, and it would be more prominently brought in contact with the religious and thoughtful mind. Its character would be more religious, and it would be presented in that form with solemn, weighty arguments drawn from the word of God. Thus the principles of temperance would be laid in the human conscience, where alone they can be laid to produce a permanent reform.

The Church itself would be benefited, and could in no sense be compromised. As the Bible Society and other societies, organized within the last century, have given a new impetus to the active energies of the Church, so would the adoption, by the Church, of the temperance reform.

Art. IV.—GAUTAMA AND LAO-TZU.*

Both India and China shared in the great movement of reform which characterized the sixth and seventh centuries previous to the advent of our Saviour. At this time the thinking minds of every nation seemed to be stirred, as by a common impulse, to seek out new channels of thought. Rome, under the leadership of Servius Tullius, was receiving that political education which laid the foundation of all her subsequent greatness. In Greece, Solon gave the people laws; Anacreon charmed them with his graceful and fervid lyrics; and Pisistratus, though usurping their power, elevated their tastes. Judah during a part of that time experienced the peaceful influence of Josiah's righteous reign, Jerusalem felt the destructive hand of her Babylonian conqueror, and the establishment of the Persian empire gave a deadly blow to the Polytheistic system which had governed Western Asia. Meanwhile Egypt passed through one of the brightest spots in the history of her civilization. And in this age, too, was begun the commercial intercourse between the West and the East.

It was pre-eminently the age of reason, and, as if it were by the irresistible movement of a great tidal wave, all the leading peoples of the world came under its inundating power. Then, as the wave receded, we find the political, social, and religious condition of the world changed and modified as by a common cause, and yet each national form marked clearly by its own national temper as induced by previous political condition and modes of thought.

India had been bound by the restrictions of Brahmanism, but was now fretting in its chains. Thought was aroused to activity, and a spirit of inquiry seemed to pervade all classes. There was manifested an intense desire to investigate and understand all subjects connected with metaphysics, ethics, and religion. While the nation was in this transition state of re-

* Works of R. Spence Hardy: "Legends and Theories of the Buddhists," "Eastern Monachism," and "Manual of Buddhism." London. E. J. Eitel: "Three Lectures on Buddhism." London. Emil Schlagintweit: "Buddhism in Thibet." London. Captain T. Rogers, R. E.: "Buddagosha's Parables." London. John Chalmers: *Tau-tê-King.* London. T. Watters: *Lao-tzŭ.* London. And various works by travelers.

ligious thought and speculation there were matured the several systems of philosophy known to have originated in this age. Singularly enough, at this time also there seemed to prevail a general opinion that some great personage was about to appear who should be possessed of such unerring intelligence and unbounded power that he would unite all these discordant elements of philosophy and religion, and produce one harmonious whole—pure and consistent.

The condition of China was different; and, though its revolution took on a speculative character, it was more decidedly tinged with ideas of a political bearing resulting from the mental condition of a people whose country was miserable, and whose lives were the prey of innumerable oppressors. In that remote age the territorial limits of China were exceedingly small as compared with their present grand extent, but even that was torn and separated by political dissensions into petty States, and these were perpetually at war with each other. Armies were constantly passing and repassing, leaving nought but desolation in the once fertile fields, and misery in the hearts of a once united and happy people. Men were taken from their homes, their families, and their work, to fight the battles of able but ambitious leaders who had risen to power. Princes forgot their duty, husbands and fathers their loyalty to home, and virtue forsook all classes, high and low, producing a state of degeneracy both moral and intellectual.

In India Vedaism had yielded to the subtle approaches of Brahmanism, and Brahmanism in turn was being undermined by a growing tendency to Atheism. The idea of one God, absolute and eternal, had given way to the theory of many deities of limited power and jurisdiction. The Hindu mind was now being repelled from these ideas, and was being rapidly carried to the opposite extreme, namely, a belief in no God. With Brahmanism developed caste, but at this time the desire seemed to be to break away from such trammels of social distinction. Such facts as these constituted the occasion for and the foundation of the new system about to be inaugurated by the expected reformer.

As in India, so also in China, the pure monotheistic ideas of the earliest ages had been observed, and the worship of the unseen Supreme Ruler had degenerated into a mere ritual ob-

servance. At the same time an exaggerated veneration for departed ancestors had led to a multiplicity of objects of worship. But now, according to the popular notions of the times, the visible universe, including all that makes up man, was an emanation from an eternal existence at once material and immaterial. Floating through the popular mind was the idea of a dualism emanating from this existence or non-existence, from which dualism all things were evolved. There existed a belief, too, in a time long past of simplicity and purity, and to all the grave seemed to be the end, no allusion being made to a state of existence hereafter.

Such, in brief, was the condition of these two great nations. Both were smarting under oppression, either religious or political, and both needed a reformer. To India he came first, and in the person of one quite in harmony with the preconceived notions of the people. It was BUDDHA, "the enlightened," "the man who knew."

He was born in the city of Kapilavastu, the capital of a country of the same name in India, near the borders of Nepaul, whence the Himalayas rise to their mighty altitudes. Suddhodana, his father, was the king; his mother was the daughter of a neighboring monarch, and he himself was the first-born and heir-apparent to the throne. He was of the family of Sakya, a branch of the powerful tribe of Gautama, and of the second or Kshatriya caste. The date of this event is shrouded in uncertainty; it is supposed to have been about 623 B. C. He was named *Siddharta.** He was called also Gautama, Sakya-Singha, and Sakya-Muni. His character and disposition are spoken of as being gentle, and yet ardent. He is also represented as being of a pensive and philanthropic nature. When sixteen years of age he† was married to a princess named Yasodharâ, and every precaution was taken by his father and family to keep him from influences that would tend to unfit him for the position of ruler, which he would be expected to assume on the decease of the king. These precautions were the more carefully attended to, because it had been foretold that he would be a recluse. In the event, how

* Siddharta or Siddhartha, signifying in Sanskrit "The Establisher."

† According to Schlagintweit, "he married Gopâ, the daughter of Dandapâni of the race of the Sâkyas."

ever, they all proved unavailing. At different times he saw a decrepit old man, a leper with loathsome sores, a dead and putrid body, and from these things he learned the vanity of all existence. On the other hand, he saw one day a priest gravely clad, gentle in manner, and of placid countenance, walking quietly along the road. Hence he reasoned that the escape from the miseries of existence were to be found in a life of contemplation. He determined to become a recluse. When he was twenty-nine years of age his first child was born. In the midst of the festivities consequent upon the event, and at a time when the attractions of home would seem the more binding, without warning, he left the palace for the forest. "He exchanged his royal diadem, with all its attendant attractions, for the alms bowl of the mendicant and its privations." This was the beginning of a life of extreme asceticism which he practiced in the wilderness, and which he consistently followed until death overtook him.

Shortly after leaving home he sought the society of the Brahmans, and remained with them much of the time for six years. The result of these years of retirement was a complete subjugation of self, and the attainment of perfect enlightenment. He came forth at thirty-five a BUDDHA. He was now "wiser than the wisest and higher than the highest," and certainly no one could be better adapted to the mission upon which he was about to enter. He combined in himself the refinement of a prince, the knowledge of a Brahman, the power of a subtle reasoner, and the self-control of an ascetic. At first he hesitated to declare the truths he had learned, but the persuasion of his friends soon overcame his unwillingness. When he began to preach the law (Dharma) it was to five old friends, Brahmans, residing near the city of Benares. Henceforth this city was to be the sacred city to all the millions of votaries who, in the centuries that have followed, have become his disciples. Here Gautama himself started on the work of proclaiming the law, preaching to all classes, and in all places wherever, in his itineraries, he might find those who, like himself, were seeking rest from the uncertainties and changes of finite existence. Large crowds in Northern and Central India followed after him. His beauty attracted them, his manners pleased them, and all were influenced by his zeal, his auster-

ities, and his eloquence. His doctrines were mild and philanthropic in their character, and these he also taught in a language that the people could understand. Not only common people followed him, but royalty also swelled his train. Binsara, the king of Mágada, was among his earlier converts; and while he was opposed by some of his own kinsmen, yet upon his return to his native city his own father and many of his relations embraced the new faith. Tradition has it that he died at the advanced age of eighty-three, having instituted a religious system which has increased in its influence, until it sways the minds of more millions than any other religion known to history.

The condition of China called forth two reformers—Lao-tzŭ and Confucius; the latter subsequent to the former, and yet contemporaneous with and a pupil of him. Of the life of Lao-tzŭ very little is known. "He was mysterious both in his birth and his death, and through all his life he seems to have courted obscurity." But by digging beneath the rubbish of superstitious and fabulous accounts we find reason for the belief that he was born about B. C. 604. Unlike his princely contemporary of India, his parents were poor. They are supposed to have lived in the kingdom now inclosed within the limits of what is called the Province of Hupeh. Unless we believe the fanciful legends which the priests of the system would impress upon the credulous, we are forced to the conclusion that his life was plain and unromantic. It is probable that he made himself familiar with the fragmentary histories and ballads of his time, and which it was afterward the work of Confucius to collate. "His type of mind was rather synthetic. He liked to sum up particular virtues and existences, and refer them to one all-embracing whole." He was accustomed to derive many beautiful lessons from nature, but in his manner of so doing he showed himself to be more of a poet than a scientific observer. But his life and his book were both characterized by a depth and independence which was far superior even to the style of Confucius. He was less practical, however, than either Confucius or Gautama. He was the "philosopher at home," rather than the "school-master abroad." His disposition, if we can judge from his teachings, was marked for humility. He was charitable, even to "rec-

ompensing injury with virtue." Such, at least, was the disposition he sought for in others, and yet there seems to be no memory of his having applied his principles to himself, and to have devoted himself to the benefit of others.

For a long time he resided at the court of Chou in the capacity of historiographer. While thus engaged he was grieved at the misery of the people and the corruption of the court, and strove to recall those in authority to a noble and generous government. "He saw the hollowness of education and government, and went to the expense of condemning all systematic education, all legislation, all official rank, and all executive government." In lieu of these, he would have governed and instructed by means of a purer example. As might be expected, he did not prove successful as a reformer. His theories were emanations from a kind and honest heart, and his own example may have been faultless; but, notwithstanding, the morals of the people were not raised, nor was the State reformed. The fortunes of the court of Chou waned, and, so soon as the prestige of the dynasty was lost, Lao-tzŭ withdrew and retired into obscurity. Whither he went no one knows. Reliable tradition follows the old man as far as the Han-ku-Kuan—the present Ling-pao—a mountain pass in the extreme west of the Province of Honan. Just before taking his final leave he yielded to the importunities of the keeper of the Pass, and wrote the book known as the "Tao-tê-King," a work declaring the meaning of Tao (reason?) and Tê (virtue.) After completing this work our philosopher passed on toward the west. His end is unknown. It is supposed that he died when about eighty-one years of age, having lived during the greater part of the sixth century before Christ.

Such was Lao-tzŭ, a man of generous impulses, possessing true nobility of character and great profundity of intellect. The only prominent point of resemblance between him and Gautama was their purpose to benefit their fellows. One was of humble extraction, the other was a prince; one sought the society of kings and their courts, the other retired from his palace and sought poverty. Lao-tzŭ was apparently discouraged at his failure to produce reformation where reform was needed, and then left the world and fell into a nameless grave; but Gautama came forth from his retirement to lead the

masses, and in his death, as in his life, was an example to those who accepted his teachings.

As to the doctrines of these two philosophers there are points of marked agreement, and they are such as to give rise to the query whether about this time the Hindu and Chinese mind did not come in contact. Gâutama embodied in his system the essential principles of a school of philosophy already existing.* The creed of Lao-tzŭ likewise was but a development of popular Chinese ideas as they existed at that period. On the part of both Hindu and Chinese minds there was a failure to keep distinct the ideas of spirit and matter. To the mind of Gautama there was no God. Lao-tzŭ, while he does not seem to have denied the existence of a God, yet makes no mention of a personal Deity. Gautama did not trace the beginning, being satisfied with the idea that this present world is one of a succession which extends back eternally. Lao-tzŭ seems to have considered the source of all existence as a power which existed, and yet did not exist—it is, and yet is not. It was indefinite, impersonal, and unconscious. It was eternal. It existed before heaven and earth and Deity. It was void, shapeless, and immaterial—capable of neither thought, judgment, activity, nor intelligence. It was fixed and impassible, and yet it contained the potentiality of all substance and shape, and from itself produced the universe, diffusing itself and permeating all space. Our sage cannot find a name for this something which is nothing, and so he calls it TAO.* All existences are evolved from *Tao*, are sustained by it, and return to it. Buddha would teach that the universe comes from and ends in *nothing*, at least such is the clear implication. His Chinese contemporary would say that it comes from and will end in something—but *this something is nothing!* Perhaps the tendency of the Chinese mind was toward Pantheism rather than Atheism, and yet it seems to have been distinctly neither. The process, as taught by both Lao-tzŭ and Confucius, and as held in China to-day, is that *Tao* (the *T'ai-Chi*, or Great Extreme of the Yi-King) generated the *Yin*, (the female prin-

* The Sankhya School.

* This word *Tao* is as untranslatable as that to which it is applied is incomprehensible. It is rendered variously as "Nature," "Reason," "The Way," "The Word," and "The Λογος."

ciple in nature.) The *Yin* produced the *Yang*, (the male or active principle.) And the union of the *Yin* and the *Yang* resulted in *Hô*, or harmony, whence come all existences. As remarked by James Freeman Clarke, it is a "duad with a monad breeding behind it." But it should be added that back of the *T'ai-Chi* (Great Extreme) is the *Wu-Chi*, (the Extreme which does *not exist*.)

According to Buddhism and Taoism, man is never the sinner. He is rather the unfortunate victim of sin. Sin itself is a necessary thing, inherent in the nature of things. It is a moral disease to which he is subject and from which he must shield himself. It is an inconvenience, and to be abhorred simply because its commission will result in personal injury. There is no moral pollution in it, but it assumes the form of misfortune to be shunned. And then, if there be no responsibility for sin, atonement is made impossible, and hence no sacrifice is required. Such was the evident teaching of Gautama, and from various passages in the *Tao-tê-King*, it may be inferred that Lao-tzŭ believed the same. He certainly regarded the infant as good by nature. The idea inculcated by his teachings is that the spirit of the child comes pure and perfect from the "Great Mother;" but it is susceptible to these evil influences, and they may operate upon it and lead it astray. After Lao-tzŭ, Confucius taught the same, and we find the same doctrine held in China to-day by all religionists.

Both of these philosophers agreed as to the occasion of suffering in this life, and taught a similar method of escape, referring to an end essentially the same—extinction of conscious being. Gautama, however, retained in his system an intermediate stage, or succession of stages, borrowed from Brahmanism, namely, transmigration. According to both, our desires are at the foundation of all sorrow. We are enslaved by them, and are, by our own acts, to get free from them. This is done by making void the human heart, draining away from it whatever ministers to passion, casting off the bondage of particular affections, and converting our principal occupation into virtual inactivity. In other words, we are to vanquish self by letting self alone! To the Taoist the consequent reward is an extension of life, together with an exemption from its ills. To the Buddhist there is the hope of a better condition in subsequent

births, with Nirvana, or ultimate extinction at the goal. The Taoist likewise returns whence he came. *Tao* receives and identifies him with her own mysterious self. In both cases man labors hard to attain it, and when obtained it is *nothing*.

Both systems were rationalistic. Gautama through the Dharma, and Leo-tzŭ by his teachings, appealed to the intellect. Both systems, though apparently benevolent in their conceptions, were in their radical thoughts essentially selfish, each man's thought being to save his own soul.

These two religions, thus instituted at about the same time in the two leading nations of Eastern Asia, spread far and rapidly. The doctrines of Gautama met with a ready acceptance in Northern and Central India, but were afterward, in the fifth century after Christ, overcome by the influence of Brahmanism, so that now, among the millions of Hindus, he has not a single follower. But the greatest conquests of Buddhism have been in other fields. "At one time," says Hardy, "its influence extended throughout nearly three fourths of Asia—from the steppes of Tartary to the palm groves of Ceylon, and from the vale of Cashmere to the isles of Japan." But its spread was not confined to Asia, for some authorities assert that about the same time that it was being supplanted from its native soil in India some of its priests crossed to America, and Buddhism was introduced in Mexico.* To-day it is the prevailing religion, under various modifications, in Thibet, Nepaul, Siam, Burmah, Japan, and South Ceylon; and in China, it is equally prominent with both Taoism and Confucianism. Professor Neumann has estimated that in China, Thibet, the Indo-Chinese countries, and Tartary, there are 369,000,000 Buddhists, and by some the figures are placed still higher.

The character of the teachings of Lao-tzŭ were not so well adapted to make their influence felt so far, and yet they have been the ruling principles, under popular modifications, of millions. For nine centuries Taoism remained the religion

* The following is a foot-note found in Schlagintweit's "Buddhism in Thibet": "Buddhism had also become known in Mexico by Chinese priests in the fifth century A. D., and had followers in that country until the thirteenth century. [illegible] the victorious Aztecs, who took possession of Mexico in the beginning of that century, put an end to Buddhism."—*Lassen, Ind. Alterth.*, vol. iv, p. 749 *et seq.*

of Thibet, at the expiration of which time it was supplanted by Buddhism; and it was the religion of Japan before the introduction of its more popular rival. In China it several times enjoyed the patronage of the Government, and even the emperors of the T'ang dynasty (seventh to tenth centuries, A. D.) were proud to claim the hoary-headed sage as their lineal ancestor.

The teachings of both of these men have been corrupted and popularized during the centuries that have followed their death. Buddhism is so liberal and tolerant that it not only never persecutes, but it adopts the most valuable ideas of all religions with which it comes in contact. And it enters into a compromise with almost every form of superstition; hence the present intermixed form in which we find it in countries where it has gained a footing. Many of the principles of Buddhism to-day are not only out of harmony with, but are absolutely opposed to, the system as promulgated by Gautama. He would have no God, but now he himself stands foremost from amid a myriad gods. To him there was no way of accumulating merit except by the suppression of desire; but now, in the majority of cases, the passions are unrestrained, while many and artificial means have been devised for the accumulation of merit. To him the end to be desired was extinction of conscious being, if not annihilation; but now millions of his disciples hope for rest in the "western heavens," and think with dread of a series of hells whose horrors are described in minutest detail. He aimed at reform, but the countries overrun by his system are left the prey of superstition and demon worship.

The system of Lao-tzŭ exists in the same degenerate condition. After many years the original conception of *Tao* became gradually obscured, and was finally reduced to a deity. As early as the fourth century, in order to compete with Buddhism, the followers of the sage "raised him from the rank of ordinary mortals, and even represented him as an incarnation of deity; and here, strangely enough, the two systems reach a point of contact, for in the Boddhisatva Manjusiri of Northern Buddhism we find a striking resemblance to Lao-tzŭ. The reward of merit, namely, extension of life, gave rise to the superstitious belief in the so-called

elixir of life, for which so many Taoists are now searching in vain. From the absolute nothing which Lao-tzŭ called *Tao*, there have been evolved innumerable gods, and there has been constructed a "Pantheon, including genii, devils, inferior spirits, and numberless other objects of worship." What was once a philosophy has degenerated into a system of necromancy, and it is now the prerogative of the priests to reconcile the living and the dead. It appeals to the very lowest wants of the people, and does not hesitate to invent divinities to promote the physical well-being of the people.

Lao-tzŭ wrote but a single work that has come down to posterity, and the *Tao-tĕ Ching* is regarded as sacred by all Taoists, and edited, and even reverenced, by both Buddhists and Confucianists. Gautama himself wrote nothing, but his sayings were carefully treasured in the memories of those who heard him, and it was at least two centuries before they were written out, having been handed down by oral tradition. From time to time additions have been made to the teachings thus recorded until, in some parts of Asia, the sacred canon is specified, not by volumes but by camel loads.

With this brief survey of the lives and teachings of these two men we take leave of them. Much was done by them toward shaping the thought and religious sentiment of hundreds of millions of human beings, and, although over twenty-four centuries have elapsed since they taught, this influence to-day is waning in its power only because of the advance of a purer Gospel as committed to man by a perfect Saviour—very God and very man. In God's economy both have had their place. The condition of millions has been bettered because of them, but it has been despite their errors. We can only pray that every devout Buddhist may be "born again," but this time of the Holy Ghost; and that every disciple of the venerable sage of China may find the "elixir of life," but may find it in Him in knowledge of whom is *life eternal*.

Art. V.—THE COSMIC PHILOSOPHY.

Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy. By John Fiske. Second Volume. Boston: Osgood & Co.

Mr. Fiske has been before the public for some time as the disciple and interpreter of Mr. Spencer, and needs, therefore, no introduction. The work before us is, in brief, a popular exposition of the Spencerian philosophy. Nor could Mr. Spencer wish for a more sympathetic interpreter. Mr. Fiske has reproduced the evolution philosophy, and that, too, with all the freshness of originality. The style leaves nothing to be desired. The obscurity, if there be any, is in the thought, and not in the expression. Our plan is to give some general hints whereby the reader may judge of the Spencerian philosophy in general, and of Mr. Fiske's work in particular. This philosophy, as based upon sensational psychology, is open to all the objections against sensationalism. Hume proved, once for all, that a sensational philosophy must end in utter skepticism. The disciples have not disproved the master's conclusion; they have ignored it, a procedure which is creditable to neither their consistency nor their insight. We will not delay, however, upon these general considerations, but proceed at once to the more specific features of the doctrine.

The student of the Spencerian philosophy is met with a puzzle at the outset in the theory of the unknowable. This theory was originally intended to reconcile science and religion by forbidding both to speculate concerning the ultimate cause of things. It is commonly understood as meaning that we can make no positive affirmations whatever concerning the ground of the universe. "It is forever inscrutable," and all our affirmations concerning it land us in insoluble contradictions. This is the common conception of the doctrine, and the greater part of Mr. Spencer's and Mr. Fiske's language supports this view. The difficulty is, that both of these philosophers have written great works concerning this ultimate ground, and have made divers positive affirmations about it; in all of which, too, they seem to have unlimited faith. Throughout their systems this unknowable appears as a mechanical cause working according to mechanical laws, and having sundry attributes and not

having sundry others. Now, it is plain that if we are to take the word unknowable in its strict sense, we should forever hold our peace after having laid down this know-nothing theory; for if it be strictly unknowable, then all theories, scientific as well as religious, are without objective validity. To set them up is a waste of time; but to claim for one greater authority than the other is a wanton impertinence. Now, as these philosophers have written books in favor of their views of things, and inasmuch as these views include sundry theories concerning the ground of things and its modes of activity, we must conclude that by unknowable they do not mean unknowable. Mr. Fiske has a passage (vol. ii, p. 469) which seems to give up the literal meaning of the word. Our notions are not false, but symbolic. But here a new difficulty arises. If a symbol is not false, it must represent, at least approximately, the true nature of the thing. If this is the theory, the unknowable becomes a mere commonplace, and the reconciliation between science and religion which it was intended to bring about vanishes. For, now that we admit that our religious and scientific symbols may approximate the truth, the question arises, Which of these symbols best represents the objective fact of the universe? That is, the old quarrel between science and religion breaks out as fiercely as ever. There is another theory, which we merely mention, namely, that when they say, We know nothing of the nature of things, the we is the we editorial, and means the opponents of the doctrine. Many passages could be brought in support of this view, as the unknowable is not unfrequently used as a sort of *Medusa's* head to petrify antagonists. We merely mention this theory, without pretending to support it. The real dilemma is this: if the ground of things be strictly unknowable, we must all keep still—scientist and theologian alike. If it is not unknowable, why, then, it is not unknowable, and every one must be allowed to bring forward his views and support them by evidence. So much for the unknowable in general. A word remains to be said concerning its value in a scientific system.

The problem of science is to find a comprehensive ground for a definite body of phenomena, and the unknowable is postulated as such a ground. But it needs no argument to show that an indefinite unknowability is worthless for this purpose. As long

as x in mathematics is brought into no definite relations to known quantities, it may stand for anything, and is nothing. But as soon as this indefinite is put into a determinate equation it acquires a fixed value. In the same way, when we attempt to solve the equation expressing the relation between the absolute and the known body of phenomena, we must either give that absolute a definite value, or throw away the equation. We must either postulate it as a definite cause with definite attributes and definite ways of working, or we must not postulate it at all. What these attributes are can be settled only by a careful study of the facts; but it is clear that there are certain conditions to be fulfilled, and a first cause which will not fulfill them must be dismissed without further ado; first, as a logical impostor, and, second, as philosophically and scientifically worthless. The Positivist doctrine, which refuses to admit anything behind phenomena, is intelligible and consistent. The opposite view, which insists upon a definite cause with assignable attributes or ways of working, is also intelligible and consistent. But the Spencerian theory, which is not content to stop with phenomena, but affirms a cause $= x$, is neither intelligible nor consistent; and neither Mr. Spencer nor Mr. Fiske have succeeded in being true to the theory. Here, again, our previous conclusion emerges that the term unknowable is not to be taken in a strict sense; that is, it degenerates into the philosophic commonplace that we do not know every thing.

But what is it to know? This question is vital to the whole discussion, and its answer describes the element of truth in the nescience doctrine. The problem of knowledge is not to tell how being is made, or to give a recipe for creation. It is rather to comprehend the manifold of existence under the various categories of thought. If any one demand how the essence of being is constituted, we cheerfully admit that we do not know. If creation were our business it might be an important question, but otherwise not. To know in the only sense possible to men is, first, to be sure that a thing exists; and, second, that it falls under certain categories, or has certain definite attributes or ways of working. Assuming, for example, that the soul exists, our knowledge thereof would consist, not in an insight into its substance, but in our certainty: first, that it exists; and, second, that it has certain definite modes of activity.

In this way we gain all our knowledge. Going out from the facts of experience, we are forced to assume, first, that a thing exists; and, second, that it has certain properties. This constitutes our knowledge of the thing. Plainly, a knowledge of the first cause in this sense must be possible, because phenomena force us to assume its existence, and to attribute to it definite properties. What these properties may be, must be determined from a study of the facts; but when the facts force us to assume such a first cause, and force us to attribute to it certain definite properties, then we know that first cause in precisely the same sense in which we know anything. This theory of knowledge leaves "the mystery of being" just where it was; and in so far the know-nothing is right, but no further. How being is made, or how action is possible, we do not know. The fact that things exist and that interaction is possible, is the great and omnipresent mystery. But to say we cannot tell how being is made is one thing; to say that we know nothing about it when it is made is quite another. Is knowledge in this sense possible? If so, we are content.

Mr. Fiske's main objection against such knowledge of the ground of phenomena is the contradictions into which reason falls whenever it ascribes any attributes whatever to the absolute. He reaches this conclusion in the regular way, namely, by analyzing the idea of the absolute, of the infinite, and of first cause. It is somewhat disheartening to find this sophism reproduced with so much confidence, resting, as it does, purely upon the etymology of the words, and not upon an analysis of their psychological content. The etymological absolute cannot co-exist with the relative, for the word means cut off and separate. No more can the etymological infinite co-exist with the finite, for etymologically the infinite is the all; and it is absurd enough to suppose that there should be something outside of the all. Hence the first cause, which we must conceive of as absolute and infinite, cannot be conceived as co-existing with the finite and relative without insoluble contradiction. Mr. Fiske makes his task still easier by defining the absolute as that "which exists out of all relations," (vol. i, p. 9;) and, of course, an absolute which never comes into any relations with anything could never come into knowledge. How the absolute thus defined could be the cause and support of phenomena, as

Mr. Fiske assumes it is, does not appear. In this way Mr. Fiske routs all theistic philosophies. Unluckily, however, etymologizing is not philosophizing; and the etymological absolute and the etymological infinite are not identical with the real absolute and the real infinite. Upon a study of nature we find that its manifold of forces and things are all conditioned and limited. We are carried, then, by the laws of our thinking, to affirm an unconditional and unlimited being. This being is *not unconditioned in the sense of being out of relation*, but as being the source of the conditions and limitations of things to which it stands in causal relation. It is not infinite in the sense of being the all, but as limiting finite things without being in turn determined by them. This is the true content of the notion of the absolute and the infinite. The absolute is not unrelated, but unrestricted by anything external to itself; the infinite is not the all, but the independent something upon which the finite depends. If the know-nothing claims that absolute and infinite are not proper terms for the being thus described, we have no objection; we only insist that the true content of these notions be kept in mind by whoever attempts to reason upon them. Grammatical exegesis is good in its place, but it cannot do the work of psychological analysis.

One need not be told that Mr. Fiske is far from faithful to his own logic. After having objected to theism because it involves the contradictory notions of the absolute, infinite, and first cause, and after having shown that the absolute cannot come into relation, he tells us, "The cosmic philosophy is found upon the recognition of an absolute power, manifested in and through the world of phenomena."—Vol. i, p. 263. When the theist said "theistic philosophy is founded upon a recognition of an absolute power (God) manifested in and through the world of phenomena," Mr. Fiske protested with all his might, "The absolute exists out of all relations;" "it can be known only by ceasing to be the absolute;" it cannot come into relation without losing its absoluteness. And yet, when, instead of theistic philosophy, we read cosmic philosophy—that is, Mr. Fiske's philosophy—the refractory and recalcitrant absolute kindly consents to be known, to enter into relations, to manifest itself in space and time—the very thing which, by the way, Mr. Fiske says it cannot do, at least for theistic

philosophers. We have failed to find any satisfactory explanation of this peculiar partiality of the absolute for the cosmic philosophy.

Again, in treating of theism, Mr. Fiske, following in the wake of Mr. Spencer, objects to it as teaching a self-existent God. The idea is declared to be viciously unthinkable, and any system involving it is found to be untenable. But here, again, the same peculiar partiality of the absolute for the cosmic philosophers appears. The fundamental reality which they postulate as the support of phenomena, turns out to be self-existent, infinite, absolute, and first cause—the very notions which were declared to be fatal to theism. The explanation is, doubtless, that the absolute is not subject to the law of non-contradiction, and if it chooses to do for the cosmists what it will not do for the theists, why the latter must grin and bear it. Of course, Mr. Fiske is serious, but his use of the absolute is strikingly like the heathen Chinee's use of the right bower. Perhaps, however, Mr. Fiske is like that old Church father whose faith was so strong that the contradictions of a doctrine were the strongest reasons for belief. It is certain that the pride of sinful reason could not be more effectually mortified than by an acceptance of the cosmist's creed on this point.

Another strong support of the know-nothing doctrine is the theory of relativity. The insufficiency of this doctrine as a theory of knowledge, so far as it is any thing but the baldest truism, has been abundantly shown, and by no one better than by Professor Martin.* We pass over this discussion, therefore, and content ourselves with pointing out the utter irrelevancy of the doctrine. For it is plain that whatever discredit this doctrine casts upon our faculties, it must be impartially distributed over them all. Such discredit, therefore, belongs as much to scientific as to religious theories. Considering, therefore, the prophecies of peace on the philosophic earth, and of good-will between scientists and theologians when once this doctrine should be recognized, it is quite disheartening to find only another instance of the mountain's being in labor and bringing forth a mouse. For universal skepticism is none—a doctrine which discredits all our beliefs and notions, leaves them all in the same relative position, and really discredits none of them. A skepticism

* See "Methodist Quarterly Review," July, 1875.

which builds upon the more immediate intuitions, and then proceeds to discredit those which lie at a greater distance from direct certainty, is the only dangerous one. For example: A skepticism which should go out from our mathematical and mechanical notions, and claim to deduce from them the moral and religious sentiments, would be absolutely fatal if it could make out its thesis. But a skepticism which discredits all alike is harmless. If the theologian can show that religious ideas have as much evidence as scientific ones, he is perfectly content to allow the skeptic to vapor as he pleases about the uncertainty of human knowledge. The healthy trust of the mind in itself, and daily contact with reality, will speedily cure these eruptions. It is too evident to need any proof that peace between science and religion can never be secured in this way, for either this doctrine reduces us all to silence, or else it allows all to speak. In the former case all theories, scientific as well as religious, are subjective delusions; in the latter case the doctrine gives us no means of deciding between rival theories. Even granting that all our notions concerning the first cause are but symbolisms, if we are to think at all, we must think in terms of those symbolisms; and the question arises whether religious or scientific symbolisms better represent the fact—shall we think of it as a mechanical cause, or as a free creator? as a blind force, or as a conscious person? Thus the problem emerges at the end of the discussion in just the same form as at the beginning, while, as in the case of the sheared pig, the amount of serviceable wool secured from the transaction is far from atoning for the discomfort of the attending outcry. This conclusion can be escaped only by saying that all our ideas are utterly false, in which case the notions of evolution and of mechanical science, as well as those of philosophy and religion, must vanish into delusion and dream, and all theorizing must cease. When Mr. Fiske claims that certain mechanical conceptions of the primal activity are the only tenable ones, and seeks thereby to deprive the theistic argument of its force, it is simply a monstrous inconsistency.

The determined skeptic may say, in criticism of our theory of knowledge, that although certain conclusions may be necessary for us, it does not follow that they are true in themselves. Our thinking comes necessarily to certain ways of regarding

the cause of things, but we can never prove that those ways are objectively real. The subjective necessity does not prove objective fact. It is admitted that the laws of our thought make the conclusion necessary, but no proof can ever be given that this conclusion represents objective fact. To refute this objection is impossible. If there be any objective necessity it can only appear in knowledge as a subjective necessity. But we may test its value by applying it. The mathematician says, "The radii of the same circle are all equal;" or "a straight line is the shortest distance between two points;" or "if equals be added to equals the sums will be equal." The relativist says, "How do you know that?" The other replies, "I cannot think them otherwise." The answer is, of course, "Ah, yes! but it is only a subjective necessity which forces you to think so; it may well be that in fact your mathematics have no objective validity." This skepticism is always possible, but the mathematician is not at all dismayed, nor do mathematics run any very serious risks from such attacks. Now the skepticism which objects to our affirmations about the first cause or any other cause on the ground of their subjectivity, has just as much value and no more; it is forever irrefutable and forever barren. It is merely gratuitous skepticism; it can offer no reasons, and so long it is a mere impertinence which busy and earnest men may justly ignore. The natural healthy trust of the mind in itself will never allow one to trouble himself long with such doubts as these. We must, therefore, regard the theory of the unknowable as a worthless piece of philosophic lumber. The psychologist rejects it as resting upon a false theory of knowledge; the scientist rejects it as coming into no intelligible relations to phenomena, and therefore useless in scientific explanations; the theologian rejects it as worthless in religion, and finally Mr. Fiske and Mr. Spencer themselves reject it by the most expressed contradictions of the theory. The only mode of escape is the one to which we have several times referred, namely, to say that the word unknowable is not to be taken in its strict sense, in which case the theory loses all meaning and importance.

It is interesting to know that the theory is rapidly falling into discredit even among scientists. A writer in the "Fortnightly Review" declares, in a review of Mr. Fiske, that

it is high time to save the evolution doctrine from its best friends, adding that this ontological abstraction of the unknowable which cannot be brought into intelligible relation to our physical theories is of no use to any one. Mr. Lewes, also, has felt called upon to repudiate Mr. Spencer's physics and metaphysics. This is an advance, and is prophetic of further progress. Hitherto, owing to the scientific language of this philosophy, every attack upon it was apt to be resented as an outbreak of theological hostility. It is gratifying, therefore, to find a growing recognition of the fact that a system does not become science by merely calling itself scientific.

We pass now to the scientific part of Mr. Fiske's system with the full understanding that the theories therein advanced shall not be allowed to take advantage of the doctrine of the unknowable to cover up weak logic, but shall be subject to the same rules of evidence and conceivability as every other system. We have seen that any discredit which Mr. Fiske's metaphysics may have thrown upon the knowing mind, must be impartially distributed all around; and, therefore, scientific, philosophic, and religious doctrines remain all in the same relative position which they had at first. We have gained, therefore, nothing from the doctrine of the unknowable except another and unusually sad instance of wasted effort. We have now to inquire whether Mr. Fiske's mechanical theory of the universe agrees better with the facts and the laws of our thinking than does the theistic theory.

We mention, in passing, a huge gap which Mr. Spencer left in his system at this point, and which Mr. Fiske has not filled up. Their unknowable in both works is left, like the gods of Epicurus, without any thing to do beyond gorgonizing opponents. This scientific exposition is based almost entirely upon the atomic conception of matter. Their deduction of the universe demands only a manifold of atoms. This granted, they are ready for unlimited deduction. These atoms, interacting according to the known laws of mechanics, must, it is proved, build up the actual universe. All phenomena are proved, with painful elaborateness, to be but special cases of molecular mechanics. Now, in all this the unknowable one plays no part; and it is plain that it is useless, unless it can be shown that the atoms necessitate the assump-

tion of a primal unity. But this is a proof which we are unable to find in either Mr. Spencer's or Mr. Fiske's writings. Both have, indeed, pronounced the atomic conception inconceivable; but, then, they have pronounced every other conception equally inconceivable; and as we must form some conception, it may as well be the atomic as any other if scientific facts seem to render it necessary. Moreover, if we should strike out from their works the arguments based upon this conception, there would be next to nothing remaining. His scientific argument, therefore, demands only the assumption of a primitive plurality and not a primitive unity. Both Mr. Fiske and Mr. Spencer have taken it very easy in this matter. It does not follow because *noumena* are inaccessible to our intelligence that they are, therefore, one. Oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, might well be unknowable in their essence without being identical in essence. Arguments might possibly be found to necessitate such an assumption, but neither Mr. Fiske nor Mr. Spencer have given them. Admitting the justice of their metaphysics, we reach a plurality of unknowables and not an unknowable one. This they have simply assumed. It might possibly be said that the correlation of the forces proves the unity of the ground of phenomena; but no one will say so who knows what the doctrine means.

Mr. Fiske reproduces Spencer's doctrine of evolution, and adopts his famous definition, as follows: "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." Of this definition much might be said. The word indefinite must not be taken strictly for that which is strictly indefinite—that is, without definite attributes or powers—is incapable of any thing. First of all, then, we must assume a definite agent or agents, with definite laws in place of the indefinite homogeneous. The homogeneous, too, must not be strictly homogeneous, for, remembering that this homogeneous represents the all, it is clear that strict homogeneity would make change impossible. Next, we replace the indefinite homogeneous by a definite heterogeneous in order to make change conceivable. The formula then reads: Evolution is a

change from a definite heterogeneous to another definite heterogeneous. Moreover, it is difficult to tell precisely what is meant by this indefinite homogeneous. One would expect the unknowable to play some part in it; but the most of the argument upon it assumes it to be the original nebula of material atoms with all their definite powers and relations, which is far enough from being an indefinite homogeneous, or even a homogeneous of any kind. Finally, Mr. Spencer's formula is a description, and not an explanation. It is not, by any means, self-evident that things must take the course here described. It is necessary, therefore, to prove that this original homogeneity must originate the present orderly system. This Mr. Spencer attempts to do by establishing the three principles of the "instability of the homogeneous," the "multiplication of effects," and the "integration of correspondences." Three very formidable looking principles which certainly ought to be able to accomplish something.

It has been a frequent boast of Mr. Spencer's admirers that his critics have not ventured to grapple with these principles, and they have further remarked that so long as these doctrines stood, Spencerism was invulnerable. Mr. Fiske, too, has great faith in them, though he refers the reader to Mr. Spencer for their full development and proof. Let us see, then, what these doctrines may have to say for themselves. And, first, we examine the alleged instability of the homogeneous. The doctrine is, that the homogeneous being unstable, must fall into heterogeneous forms, and some of these heterogeneities will be worlds, and solar systems, and forms of life, and these will go on improving until things look as if they had had an intelligent maker. The doctrine looks amazingly like the old doctrine of chance; but has this principle itself any warrant? Remember, this homogeneous is to be considered mechanically; and now suppose the original force perfectly homogeneous, what will follow? If homogeneous, it must be in equilibrium, and change could never result. The mathematician knows this, and proves that if the world be merely a mechanical system, it must have been in motion with a certain direction and velocity from all eternity, because no interaction of any system of material bodies can affect the sum of their motion measured in any direction whatever. The examples given by Mr. Spen-

cer and Mr. Fiske consist invariably of seeming homogeneities in the presence of heterogeneous forces, and the resulting action is offered as an illustration of the instability of the homogeneous:—

> In the impossibility of balancing an accurately made pair of scales, in the equal impossibility of keeping a tank of water free from currents, in the rusting of iron, and in the uneven cooling of heated metals, is exemplified the principle that the state of homogeneity is an unstable state. Universally the tendency of things amid the conflict of unlike forces is toward heterogeneity.—Vol. i, p. 353.

This is as good as any thing that either Mr. Spencer or Mr. Fiske has upon the subject. "Things amid the conflict of unlike forces" are universally adduced as illustrations of the homogeneous! The rusted iron is a composite effect depending on the interaction of iron and nascent oxygen; the two together being far enough from homogeneous. If instead of oxygen one should put nitrogen in contact with the iron, the homogeneity would not be diminished, and yet it would be stable enough. The light bearing either is assumed to be homogeneous, but it shows no signs of instability. Even our own atmosphere is sufficiently homogeneous to allow the principle a fair chance to work, but it does not evolve any thing to speak of.

Mr. Spencer, however, is not content with an induction of this principle. It is not sufficient to point out that mortar gets lumpy, that iron rusts, and that jelly is very apt to candy; it must be rationally deduced from some ulterior principle. And here the hopeless helplessness of the doctrine appears. The principle upon which the instability of the homogeneous rests is the persistence of force. Force is forever at work producing changes, and hence the instability of the homogeneous. But it is plain that instability in general, both of the homogeneous and of the heterogeneous, ought to result from such a principle. Force is ever weaving, and force is ever unweaving; hence all things pass. But how in the face of this notion Mr. Spencer can erect the stability of the heterogeneous into a principle is one of the many mysteries which he has bequeathed to the philosophic world. One can easily understand how necessary the assumption is to fit out the new philosophy; but where it finds its warrant in any mechanical system is more than we

can tell. Mr. Spencer offers it as a fact, however, and points out that it is exemplified in the paths of the planets, none of which are circles (homogeneous) but rather ellipses (heterogeneous.) We are not quite sure of the principle by which the ellipse is determined to be heterogeneous and the circle homogeneous; but the pretended stability of the elliptical orbit lies in the fact that a curve may go through any number of variations and still be an ellipse, while the circle cannot change at all without ceasing to be a circle. The orbits of the planets are never the same ellipses from one hour to another; but since the ever-changing orbit remains an ellipse, the common name is made to cover the variability, and the result is held up as an example of the stability of the heterogeneous! Finally, the other principle of the integration of correspondences is the direct contradiction of the instability of the homogeneous. The aim of that principle is to get like with like, that is, to produce the homogeneous—a procedure against which the instability of the homogeneous must resolutely set its face. Hence, the three great creative principles are at war with one another, and no one can be true without destroying the rest. It is possible enough that here, as elsewhere, wisdom is justified only of her children, and that some peculiar insight is vouchsafed to the disciples of this school which is denied to the outside world. There seems to be no other way of explaining the enthusiasm which they seem to feel.

In fact, this whole attempt to make the order of the world mechanically intelligible is an unpardonable sin against the first principles of the mechanical theory. The notion of a mechanical system is not very clearly defined, but this certainly belongs to it: any given event flows with necessity from its antecedents. Hence, if at any point whatever in the flow of things we make a cross section, we find the actual balance and disposition of things which must in time bring forth the present order. If now, with Mr. Spencer and Mr. Fiske, we view nature mechanically, there never was a time when the present order was not given, or when any other order was possible. It is plain, therefore, that a mechanical system does not really explain the order of the universe, but assumes it at the start. The fundamental fact of such a system is an orderly ongoing of the universe, and all that appears in the course of that

ongoing must be regarded, not as explained by science, but as the several phases of the first fact thus assumed. The seeming indeterminateness of lower forms, instead of explaining the harmony and order of the higher ones, is only a preliminary stage through which the universal unfolding has passed in its onward march. The elements are assumed in definite relations, with definite powers and definite direction, so that no other order than the present is possible. By and by, the implicit assumption becomes the explicit fact, and then the whole is held up as a miracle of constructive reasoning. Teleology is forthwith warned off, and word goes round that intelligence is no longer needed to explain the harmony and order of the universe. If it could be shown that the physical order is sufficient unto itself, and that every thing can be explained by reference to it, then, and only then, would teleology be finally overthrown. In that case, however, nothing would be explained; every thing would be assumed. The error of Mr. Spencer in attempting a mechanical explanation of the universe lies in the assumption that the elements were once a chaos, without definite law, order, or relation. Science, however, knows of no such time. The present forms of things have not always existed, but science knows of no time when the present order of law and of definite relation did not exist; and science knows of no point in the physical flow of things which was not determined by its antecedents. As science, therefore, it knows nothing of a first moment or of a chaos. If, however, an indefinite and chaotic condition of things were thinkable, the chances are infinity to one against any production of harmony or order therefrom. A font of type, knocked into pi, and shaken, would sooner produce a reasonable discourse, than a chaotic mass of atoms would build up the harmony of creation. Mr. Spencer has completely missed the true conception of mechanical science, and his objections to teleology on the authority of his speculations are the weakest possible. The same is to be said of Mr. Fiske's attempt to play off the Darwinian theory against teleology. A mechanical science which understands itself does not go behind phenomena, but rather below them; and if the aim is to dispense with a God, it does not talk of a first moment or of a primal chaos—neither of which are thinkable—but rather of a self-centered world-order, of which

the changes of things are the several phases. Such atheistic science recognizes that it explains nothing, but assumes every thing. When, however, the teleologist objects that that order must be explained, the just reply is, Every system must assume something to start with, and why may not a primal order be that first fact? What better right has chaos to existence than harmony? It is the everlasting wonder of the world that it should be so, but then it is so. This reply, which is the strongest one that atheistic science can make, renders the ordinary teleological argument worthless. It points out that nature is driven from behind and not led from before, and that, therefore, final causes are rendered needless by the demonstrable sufficiency of the physical causes to explain phenomena. To meet this argument teleology must reconstruct its argument and choose another stand-point. It must show that this world-order is not independent; and it must show that the very notion of science involves the doctrine of final cause. This, however, is not the place for this discussion. It is plain that Mr. Spencer's and Mr. Fiske's attempt to do away with final causes involves a pitiable lack of insight into the conditions of the problem. From this stand-point their formula of evolution reduces to this: Evolution is evolution.

Nevertheless, Mr. Spencer and Mr. Fiske both claim that this doctrine is not atheism; for although all phenomena, mental and physical alike, can be expressed in terms of matter and motion, and although the seeming intelligence of the universe is but a necessary result of simple mechanical laws, still the fundamental reality is neither matter nor spirit, but a something above both. To be sure, both philosophers habitually speak of this reality in terms of matter and motion; but both are equally emphatic in denying that it can be identified with matter and motion. Mr. Fiske declares that if he had to choose between saying that God is a force and God is a spirit, he would prefer the former expression. However, there is no need of choice, for the fundamental reality is above both matter and spirit. We cannot, indeed, conceive of it; but, then, it lies in the very notion of the unknowable to be unconceivable; and to say that there can be nothing higher than spirit and intelligence, is to confound the inconceivable with the impossible. This is the gist of their argument upon this point. Mr. Spencer

further illustrates it by reference to the impiety of the pious, and dressing up an old satire of Xenophanes. The position is, nevertheless, untenable, for whatever we think of must be thought of in either terms of matter or spirit; there is no room in thought for this third something which is neither. Very good, says Mr. Fiske; but do you not see that you are erecting the limits of thought into the limits of being? You are asserting that a thing is impossible because you cannot think it. I occupy a much more modest position, and I find it entirely possible that there may be orders upon orders of being above either material or spiritual existence. It is quite possible, says Mr. Spencer, that there may be forms of being as far above intelligence as intelligence is above mechanism. We answer, we are not concerned about the limits of possibility at all. If they choose to solace themselves with dreams of possible orders of being, we have no objection; but when such an assumption appears as a factor in a philosophical system, we do mean to have it proved, and an appeal to possibility is no proof. The possible is not necessarily real. Remember, we are trying to explain a definite body of material and mental phenomena, and not to invent hypotheses. A spiritual cause will furnish such an explanation; but what help do we get from postulating this third something which is neither material nor spiritual, conscious nor unconscious? It merely doubles our difficulties and removes none. Besides, the notion is nothing new in philosophy. Spinoza adopted it, Schelling adopted it, and neither succeeded in making anything out of it. It was pure assumption to start with, and pure assertion to end with; of no value to science, and impossible in thought. We rule it out, therefore, as both useless and unprovable, and return to see what objections Mr. Fiske has to offer concerning the cause of things as a living intelligence.

Although Mr. Fiske claims to have shown that intelligence is needed to produce the harmony of the universe, he, nevertheless, says that this problem of an intelligent God is incapable of demonstrative solution either way:—

> I believe that it is beyond the power of science to prove that the Divine Power immanent in the cosmos, either does or does not work by anthropomorphic methods. We cannot expect, therefore, to obtain a result which, like a mathematical theorem, shall

stand firm through mere weight of logic; or which, like a theorem in physics, can be subjected to a crucial test.—Vol. ii, p. 378.

It would seem at first sight as if the explanation of the universe by mechanical causes would render the assumption of intelligence needless; possibly, however, Mr. Fiske has doubts concerning the thoroughness of his mechanical explanation, and orders up the following reinforcements:—

Here we are upon the brink of the abyss into which the anthropomorphic hypotheses must precipitate us, if instead of passively acquiescing in it as a vague authoritative formula, we analyze it with the scientific appliances at our command. To those who have acquired some mastery of the physical truths upon which our cosmic philosophy is based, the doctrine not only ceases to be intellectually consoling, but becomes a source of ungovernable disturbance. For to represent the Deity as a person who thinks, contrives, and legislates, is simply to represent him as a product of evolution. The definition of intelligence being the continuous adjustment of specialized inner relations to specialized outer relations, it follows that to represent the Deity as intelligent, is to surround Deity with an environment, and thus to destroy its infinity and its self-existence. The eternal Power, whereof the web of phenomena is but the visible garment, becomes degraden into a mere strand in the web of phenomena, and the cosmos is exchange for the loss of the infinite and inscrutable God, receives an anomalous sovereign of mythologic pedigree.—Vol. ii, p. 398.

As the result, Mr. Fiske says:—

Our choice is no longer between an intelligent Deity and none at all: it lies between a limited Deity and one that is without limit. For, as the foregoing discussion has plainly shown, and as it must appear in every similar discussion of the subject in terms of the doctrine of evolution, an anthropomorphic God cannot be conceived as an infinite God. Personality and infinity are terms expressive of ideas which are mutually incompatible. The pseudo idea, "infinite person," is neither more nor less unthinkable than circular triangle.—Vol. ii, p. 401.

We doubt if Mr. Fiske would have been quite so dogmatic if he had been a little surer of his position. The extra emphasis seems to flow from an uneasy, half-consciousness that the positions are armed chiefly with Quaker guns. Merely noting, by the way, that the fundamental reality appears in this quotation as self-existent, an impossible idea according to Mr. Fiske, the objections urged are two: God cannot be intelligent, first, because intelligence is the "continuous adjustment of specialized

inner relations to specialized outer relations;" and, second, because intelligence is only thinkable as a product of evolution. It is quite a favorite method with the philosophers of the new school to define their terms in their own interests; thus Mr. Spencer, in arguing against Mr. Martineau, that mind cannot be the cause of things, quietly defines mind as "a series of states of consciousness," and calls upon Mr. Martineau to show how a series of sensations could account for the universe. Mr. Fiske also appears with a definition framed in the interests of his philosophy, and having defined intelligence as "the continuous adjustment of specialized inner relations to specialized outer relations," there is no more to be said upon the subject. Still, victory by definition is so cheap as to arouse suspicion. A philosopher of the old school might object that by an intelligent being he means one capable of conscious thought, knowledge, and action; and for aught we see, this definition would be full as consonant with experience as the other about inner and outer relations. Moreover, Mr. Fiske's definition does not cover the greater part of our intellectual life. It applies, if at all, only to sense perception; but gives no account of the abstract and creative action of the mind, in which there is no trace of adjustment to outer relations. Besides, the definition itself needs explanation. What is meant by "inner relations?" There is really no place for true inwardness in the mechanical scheme. The expression means nothing, unless it means a knowing subject, and then the definition runs, "Intelligence is the continuous adjustment of the knowing subject to the various objects which surround it." This adjustment, however, appears to be only the subject's knowledge of objects, for any other adjustment presupposes conscious intelligence; that is, the subject's conscious adjustment of himself to his surroundings would imply a previous knowledge of those surroundings. The definition, then, becomes "Intelligence is a continuous knowing," a very safe proposition, but not a very valuable one. The philosopher of the old school might further point out that although our intelligence is developed, it does not lie in the notion of intelligence that it must be developed. An eternal intelligence is, metaphysically, as possible as an eternal non-intelligence. As to the objection that intelligence and consciousness are incompatible with infinity, we may remark that the denial of those

modes of being to the fundamental reality is even more fatal to its infinity. Intelligence and consciousness are higher modes of being than unintelligence and unconsciousness; and to deny them to the infinite is to limit it both qualitatively and quantitatively. Mr. Fiske declares that the infinite must have all power, include all modes of being, and yet it cannot fulfill the conditions of conscious intelligence. But Mr. Fiske's argument on this point is mainly a quibble, based upon a false notion of the infinite. The really weighty objections against the personality of the infinite are not those which he gives.

This question concerning the personality and the intelligence of the first cause has been so twisted and inverted by modern philosophers that it has passed into a philosophical dogma that the notion is self-destructive. It may, therefore, be worth while to leave Mr. Fiske for the moment, and inquire whether this traditional philosophic dogma is any thing but a prejudice. The question is whether this infinite power back of phenomena exists for itself? whether its activity is attended with consciousness? In affirming personality of that power we merely mean to give an affirmative answer to these questions. The objections thereto, we conceive, are mainly logical rather than psychological. First, it is said that consciousness involves the distinction of subject and object. The destruction of either factor is fatal to consciousness. The reply is, that though the subject may not be thought, except in distinction from an object, it can certainly be experienced without any such distinction. The developed self-consciousness of the mature man acquires form and fullness through this distinction, but it rests as a fact upon an immediate feeling of self. There has never been any successful attempt to deduce this immediate feeling itself from any interaction of a subject and object. It is an ultimate and primal fact of our soul life. It is, too, just as strong in the child as in the developed man. The child knows nothing of ego and non-ego, of subject and object; but he certainly has as lively a feeling of himself as could be desired. The conscious antithesis, then, of subject and object, is not necessary in order to experience one's self. Besides, logically, the notion of self must have a positive content if the notion of not-self is to have any meaning whatever. To make each the mere negation of the other is to reduce both to zero.

It is further urged, that though our consciousness is not caused by the outer world, it is, nevertheless, occasioned by it. The soul may well contain in it the laws of its development, so that upon proper occasion it shall develop only in certain directions; yet this development depends both for its impulse and for its continuance upon the co-working of an external world. Externality is, therefore, absolutely necessary for the production of consciousness; hence it is concluded that the first cause, for whom there is no objective world, cannot be conscious. The reply is, first, that the continuance of our intellectual life does not depend on external impulse. When once the stream of association is formed, and the constructive powers of the mind are awakened, there is thenceforth no further need of external impulse to maintain the stream of conscious life at its full. In the second place, while our consciousness has a beginning, it does not lie in the notion of consciousness that it should have a beginning. To the question, What originally started the stream of thought in the eternal mind? we reply, It never was started. Of course, the objector's hands go up at this, but before he breaks out we beg leave to call one or two points to his attention. Credit is very unequally divided between scientists and theologians. The metaphysical difficulties involved in scientific statements are generally overlooked or taken on trust; while the moment statements are made on the other side, which involve no greater difficulties, these objections are brought out in a mass. Every system of the world must begin with something of which it is impossible to give any further account than that it is. The necessary assumption of every materialistic or mechanical system is an eternal motion either in the world substance or among the physical elements. The theistic system, on the contrary, postulates as its primal fact, back of which it cannot go, an eternal mind, whose consciousness and whose thoughts, like itself, are from everlasting. Now it is plain that the metaphysical objections against the latter doctrine are at least no greater than those against that of an eternal mechanical motion; and we object, therefore, to bringing them forward as fatal in one case, while every thing is taken on trust in the other. The objections against it are merely the incomprehensibility of all ultimate facts, or they consist in transferring to the infinite the limitations of our finite minds.

The objection that consciousness implies finiteness is a mere quibble based upon the mistaken notion that the real infinite must be the all. It is, in brief, a striking proof of the inverted position of our philosophy that it is necessary to prove that the conditions of self-knowledge, and of knowledge in general, are not lacking to the infinite power which we are told contains the fullness of being and transcends all limitations. Indeed, we must say with Lotze,* that full personality is possible only to the infinite. We ourselves are more passive than active. But a small part of the powers that work within us are our own. We are the theater upon which mysterious forces appear. We have but the scantiest insight into our own nature. In so far we are machines rather than persons. Pure personality exists only where the nature is transparent to self; where all the powers are under absolute control; where the spirit remains ever by itself, and where past and present are equally transparent. Such personality is not ours; it can belong only to the infinite, of whose full personality ours is but the faint and imperfect image.

Returning to Mr. Fiske, his solution of the materialistic question demands attention. He fairly labors in repelling the charge of materialism to find words to express himself; we must, therefore, believe that Mr. Fiske does not mean to be a materialist. In attempting to determine, however, what Mr. Fiske's doctrine is, the chronic difficulties of his exposition still beset us. We understand that his formula of evolution is intended to cover the whole field of mind as well as of physics, and according to that formula the development of mind is only a special case of the "redistribution of matter and motion." Mental phenomena appear only in connection with material phenomena, and both disappear together. The mental action is a function of nervous organization, and disappears along with it. This is undoubtedly the doctrine of a good part of Mr. Fiske's exposition, and this is what common people mean by materialism. The name is indifferent so long as the matter be understood. If the redistribution of matter and motion includes and accounts for all phenomena, then the world will continue to regard this system as materialistic in spite of Mr. Fiske's protest. On the other hand Mr. Fiske's views, like

* "Mikrokosmus," vol. iii, S. 573 ff.

those of Mr. Spencer, appear to have undergone an evolution in the course of the discussion, and we find toward the close of his work the most emphatic denial of the possibility of expressing mental phenomena in terms of material ones.* In a recent work, "The Unseen World," Mr. Fiske has the following emphatic passages:—

> Modern discovery, so far from bridging over the chasm between mind and matter, tends rather to exhibit the distance between them as absolute. . . . But what has been less commonly remarked, is the fact that when the thought and the molecular movement thus occur simultaneously, in no scientific sense is the thought the product of the molecular movement. . . . To be sure, the thought is always there when summoned, but it stands outside the dynamic circuit as something utterly alien from and incomparable with the events which summon it.—Pp. 41, 42.

We think Mr. Fiske quite correct in these statements; indeed, we doubt if the relation of the mind to the brain has ever been so clearly expressed. But who does not see that the original evolution formula has hopelessly broken down? The mind refuses in any way to be brought into line with matter, and the whole mental world lies outside of the redistribution of matter and motion; and the dreaded dualism of mind and matter remains an impassable gulf. An attempt is made to bridge it by an appeal to the unknowable—that is, by an appeal to *x*, which is, in fact, an abandonment of the problem. Besides, the attempt to find a common cause for these incommensurable sets of phenomena is a sin against the first principles of empiricism. The great rule of empirical induction is, that like effects indicate like causes. The converse of this proposition is, that irreducible difference in the effects indicates difference in the causes, and the attempt to unite them in one is a failure. It may be possible to other philosophies, but never to empiricism.

Of the numberless other points that have puzzled us we will mention only one. In the chapter on Causation, Mr. Fiske expressly teaches that causation is nothing but unconditional and invariable sequence. The notion that the antecedent exercises any controlling force whatever upon the consequent is distinctly repudiated. We have really labored to imagine what need there is of a fundamental reality in such a scheme. For as every phenomenon is really independent of every other

* Vol. ii, part iii, chap. iv.

—a self-creation, in fact—there is no need to assume a fundamental reality for its support. Besides, if we assume such a fundamental reality, it can contribute nothing to the production of the phenomenon, being itself only one more powerless antecedent. Plainly, if we are to abide by this notion of causation, we can get along as well without this new antecedent as with it; and inasmuch as the sum of phenomena has no real causal connection with this reality, their existence can never be any reason for postulating it. The same difficulty returns when we read the chapter on freedom of the will. There Mr. Fiske finds himself called upon in the name of causation to reject the notion of freedom. There would seem to be some warrant for this, if a compelling external force controlled all volitions; but surely there need be no difficulty with the doctrine of freedom if every phenomenon, as well those of volition as of the outer world, is strictly independent of external control. We have never been able to see what possesses empirical philosophers, after denying the reality of interaction, to lug in the notion when they treat of mental phenomena. Upon their principles, there is no more reason for assuming uniformity in either the outer or inner world, than there is for assuming non-uniformity. There can be no *à priori* reasoning upon the subject; and if experience point to freedom of the will, they can consistently urge nothing against it. The solution of this mystery, as well as of many others in Mr. Fiske's exposition, must be left to posterity. Possibly, however, posterity will never hear of the work; and in that case the secret will probably be buried with its author.

Thus we have touched upon the principal peculiarities of the cosmic philosophy. It goes without saying that its sensational psychology cannot stand the strain which the system makes upon it. Pure sensationalism undermines the possibility of science and system, and its legitimate outcome is nihilism. Whenever, therefore, any one attempts to build up a system on such principles, it is inevitable that he should contradict his own theory at every step. The cosmic philosophers are no exception to this rule, and their contradictions are more numerous and glaring than others in proportion as their system is more ambitious. But this lies in the nature of the case, as we said at the beginning,

and we may therefore pass the point in silence. The peculiarities of the system we find unsatisfactory enough. They are expressed throughout in an ambiguous language which gives one a high idea of the advantages of a judicious looseness of statement; but when forced to speak one tongue, they either destroy themselves, or sink to commonplaces. We have no doubt that Mr. Spencer and Mr. Fiske really think that they have furnished a higher and truer conception of the world than that given by theistic philosophy; but unfortunately the theology of the unknowable contains so many affronts to reason, and still worse, its logic is so partial or amphibious, that we doubt if the new doctrine will much advance the interests of either religion or science.

Art. VI.—THE HISTORY OF PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN INDIA.

The History of Protestant Missions in India, from their Commencement in 1706 *to* 1871. By Rev. M. A. Sherring, M.A., LL.B., London. London: Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1875.

It was the small but willing hand of Denmark that first laid hold of the long lever of the Gospel in attempting to raise to a better life the benighted millions of India. It was this "little one" of the Protestant nations of Europe that stepped forth to sow broadcast the good seed of the word in this rich but neglected field, belonging then, as it has since, chiefly to England. It seems marvelously strange now, with near a thousand foreign missionaries, occupying more than a thousand stations and substations of this great land, and representing various Churches in England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Denmark, Canada, the United States, and Australia, with the Gospel preached in every dialect and printed in every tongue; with Christian schools, colleges, orphanages, and hospitals scattered over the land; with India so near London (thanks to the energy of the French canal-maker) that the heir apparent of the throne of Great Britain makes a pleasure trip to and through it, traveling thousands of miles in his palace car, and speaking every morning by submarine cable with her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales at Windsor Castle; it seems very strange that with the East India Company holding the keys to this vast empire so many score

of years, the Churches of England did nothing to save their heathen brethren of this eastern land Even eighty years after the beginning of missionary operations in India, the leaders of the English and Scottish Churches, those whose sermons were longest and whose published volumes were thickest, kept their faces firmly set against all missionary work among heathen nations. As has been truly remarked, we are

> Forced to wonder now how these venerable pillars of the Church could go on reading from their pulpits those glorious Messianic psalms and prophecies which speak of the spread of Messiah's kingdom to earth's remotest bounds, and of the ingathering of the heathen, as fellow-heirs in all its light and liberty and joy; who could go on reading the Saviour's last command to his disciples, in virtue of which they themselves were commissioned as ministers of his word, without catching a single glimpse of the meaning wrapped up in these pregnant words, or being fired with one spark of zeal for the speedy advent of the Saviour's kingdom. That they did so, that they continued so long to read with "the vail upon their hearts," reads to us a most emphatic and important lesson—this, namely, that men can only find in the Bible and take out of it that which they have spiritual insight to see and comprehend; that the man of small heart and contracted sympathies will altogether fail to see and grasp truths that sparkle on the sacred page, and lie revealed in Heaven's own light to the man of large heart and broader sympathies.*

The author of the work whose title stands at the head of this article devotes the opening pages of an interesting and timely volume to the missionary operations begun and carried forward by the Danes, and we may begin with him at the beginning.

On the 17th of November, 1705, Frederick IV., king of Denmark and Norway, gave royal letters to Henry Plutschau and Bartholomew Ziegenbalg, who had been students at the University of Halle, appointing them missionaries to Eastern India; exhorting them to labor earnestly among the pagans they should find, to specially betake themselves to God's word, to follow the Saviour's example in preaching repentance and remission of sins, and to show themselves patterns of good works in order to win over "the poor, blind heathens." Twelve days later the enthusiastic students left Copenhagen on their long journey, "with faith in an all-powerful God and confidence in the promises of his holy word." The vessel in which

* "Indian Evangelical Review," p. 205, (1875.)

they sailed was the "Sophia Hedewig." On the 9th of July, 1706, they arrived at their desired haven, Tranquebar, the chief town of the Danish colony, on the Coromandel coast, distant from Madras one hundred and forty miles.

They at once entered upon their appointed work:—

Both had zeal; that of Plutschau was patient and calm, but that of Ziegenbalg was fiery. One followed, the other led. One had the gift of organization, and enthusiasm to face and surmount all difficulties; the other, besides courage, had the faculty of laboring steadily and well. Both could endure much; but Ziegenbalg endured hardship longer than his fellow-laborer.

In beginning their work they met with little sympathy from the European residents, who, like most persons in England and elsewhere, regarded the enterprise as visionary and absurd. Notwithstanding the king's injunctions opposition was shown them, especially by the governor of the Colony, a Norwegian by birth. Ziegenbalg was thrown into prison, and kept in close confinement for four months:—

There he pined in solitude forbidden the use of pen and paper, and prohibited from holding intercourse with the outer world. On regaining his freedom, he found, to his dismay, that the small community of converts from the heathen, which he and his colleague had gathered together, had been scattered to the winds by persecution and terror. Some were in prison; others were banished; and the mission seemed in ruins. Nothing daunted, Ziegenbalg, in spite of bodily weakness and disease, recommenced his work. Being in great need of money, four thousand crowns were sent to him from home in two ships, one of which was wrecked, and although the money was recovered, it was taken back to Copenhagen. The other ship reached Tranquebar in safety, but as the money was being brought to shore, the boat, which was in charge of drunken sailors, upset, and the whole was lost. Still, these two brave men kept at their post, undismayed by disappointment, hardship, and loss.

Before many years had passed other missionaries arrived, and new stations were occupied. But as the work spread the opposition on the part of those in authority increased, and in 1714, when Ziegenbalg returned to Europe, he proceeded at once to represent the state of affairs to the king. He found him at the siege of Stralsund, in Pomerania, taking part in the great struggle with Charles XII.:—

One evening there was evidently a profound movement among the Danish troops. A stranger of note had had an audience of the

king, who had shown him singular favor, and for hours, it was said, they had been closeted together. The soldiers, who had gathered round, may have been disappointed when they saw that he was only a clergyman, a man indeed of a commanding presence, of a wonderful dignity and fire, resolute and calm, with a keen eye, a bronzed and almost swarthy face seamed with deep lines of care, and a winning courtesy and lovableness of manner; but when he opened his lips and preached to them, and they heard it was Mr. Ziegenbalg, the missionary from Tranquebar, there were some, at least, who ceased to wonder at his welcome from the king. To the camp Ziegenbalg had hurried with all speed. Letters had given no warning of his journey, and he seemed to have dropped out of the clouds. He was accustomed to rapid movement, and the mission had no time to spare; but he got his story told to the king, and he was content. Some days were snatched from war for this work of peace; changes and arrangements were proposed in the management of the mission; Ziegenbalg was informed that his patent of superintendent had already been sent to India, and for details he was referred to Copenhagen. Thither he journeyed with restless speed; and then into Germany, to Francke and Halle, halting little at any place, but preaching to vast crowds, who filled the churches and swayed out into the street, "very weak," we are told, yet kindling, by his presence, the zeal of all the mission friends, and moving his audiences as he would, by his glowing appeals.*

After visiting England, where he was enthusiastically received, this great leader returned to India. But his work was about ended, and he came back only to die:—

He had overstrained his powers, and had spent himself before he had attained to middle age. In the autumn of 1718 he was smitten by disease, from which he rallied for a time, but which reappearing he sank to rest February 23, 1719. Three hundred and fifty-five converts, and a numerous body of catechumens, mourned over his loss. He had been the guiding spirit of the mission, every department of which, through all the vicissitudes which it had undergone, having felt the influence of his enthusiasm, his patience, and his love. He labored with the inspiration of an apostle, and with the elasticity of a man determined to rise above every obstacle.

The work extended from Tranquebar to other cities along the sea-coast, and into the interior. In 1726, Schultze, an earnest and scholarly missionary, proceeded to Madras, where he established a mission and gathered in a number of converts. Between 1736 and 1746 near four thousand persons were bap-

* From "Good Words," for December, 1872.

tized, and the knowledge of Christianity was scattered through Tranquebar, portions of Tanjore, and cities, towns, and villages on the Coromandel coast from Madras to Ramnad.

On July 30, 1750, occurred an event which was of great moment in the history of Indian missions, the arrival in India of Christian Frederic Schwartz:—

> Thenceforward for many years, the missionary enterprise in that land, in its progress and development, was intimately associated with the life and labors of this distinguished man. Both Protestant and Roman Catholic missions are able to boast of a long list of earnest and zealous men, from their first establishment in India down to the year in which this testimony is recorded; and they are especially proud of individual men, who by their transcendent ability and devotion shone with brilliant luster, reflecting a divine light far and near, and who for a long period were powerful centers of attraction and influence, and, on finally passing away, left a long line of light behind them. The history of the British possession of India is remarkable for great names. Men of uncommon force as soldiers, civilians, and statesmen, rising far above mediocrity into the regions of true genius, have never been wanting. They have not only imparted imagination and vivacity to this otherwise dull tropical life, but have likewise contributed largely to the success of those stupendous movements which the Government has occasionally undertaken. Each period of British Indian history is connected with great names, which figure conspicuously in its foreground, give to it its brightest colors, and prevent it from becoming uninteresting and tame. In like manner, in the history of Christian missions in India, the eye rests with pleasure on celebrities like Schwartz, Carey, Martyn, and Duff, and others of equal rank, whose varied talents and accomplishments have elevated the missionary body in India to a position of intellectual greatness inferior to none.

This "Apostle of India," as he has well been called, after forty-eight years spent uninterruptedly in the mission-fold, passed from labor to reward. At his death in February, 1798, "a long and bitter cry of lamentation arose from multitudes, and the rajah (of Tanjore) shed a flood of tears over his body, and covered it with a gold cloth."

With the death of Schwartz the first period of Protestant missions in India may properly be said to end. After this date but a few Danish missionaries arrived, and although several continued to labor at Tranquebar and elsewhere during the early part of the present century, the interest decreased, and the missions were either abandoned, or incorporated with those of the

Church of England. After the lapse of several decades the people of Denmark were aroused to renewed activity in missionary work, and for the past thirty years they have been sending laborers to Tranquebar and other of the old stations. Had this revival occurred in 1800, instead of 1845, there would not have been the sad and deplorable cessation in the mission work begun so many years ago, and carried so vigorously forward for nearly a hundred years.

After Tranquebar—the Plymouth Rock of Indian Missions—stands Serampore, the memorable working place of those earnest laborers, Carey, Marshman, and Ward. It was here that the Baptist Missionary Society (forced into existence by the irresistible enthusiasm of the Northamptonshire shoemaker) began its operations in India. Mr. Carey came to India in 1793 along with Mr. Thomas, who had formerly been a surgeon in the service of the East India Company. The two labored for a few years to the north of Calcutta among the indigo factories, preaching and translating the Scriptures. In 1799 four new missionaries from England arrived, and, owing to the hostility of Government, it was decided to establish the head-quarters of the mission at Serampore, a Danish settlement fifteen miles from Calcutta. The new missionaries encountered violent opposition from Government.

When the ship's papers were presented to the government official in Calcutta, it was at once determined to send the missionaries back to England, and to seize the ship until they should comply with the demand of the Government by returning to their native land. Fortunately, Colonel Bie, the Danish governor of Serampore, was not the man to yield to an unjust interference with his authority; and as he had taken the missionaries under his protection, he was not inclined to give them up. The Marquis of Wellesley, who was then governor-general, after some hesitation let the matter drop, and the missionaries were left to themselves.

It soon became apparent that the men who had thus barely escaped being sent out of the country, as if they were rebels or breakers of the peace, had come to India with a grand purpose in view, and with clear heads, warm hearts, and willing hands. The story of Serampore is interesting indeed, and has been written again and again. The first attention of the missionaries was given to the printing-office:—

With the exception of two books of the Old Testament, the translation of the whole Bible in the Bengalee language was completed. Mr. Ward set the first types with his own hands, and presented Mr. Carey with the first sheet of the New Testament on the eighteenth of March, 1800. The feeling of exultation with which it was contemplated, and the great prospects which it opened up, may be more easily imagined than described. The twenty-fourth of April was selected as a day of thanksgiving for the establishment of the mission in circumstances so favorable. At this meeting the missionaries voted an address to the king of Denmark, expressing their warmest gratitude for the generous protection which his servants had extended to their undertaking, and soliciting his permission to continue the settlement and prosecute their labors. In the ensuing year His Majesty, Frederick VI., signified the gratification he felt at the establishment of the mission in his dominions, and informed the missionaries that he had their institutions under his special protection.*

The first convert was baptized in the presence of the governor and a vast multitude of Hindus and Mohammedans, Portuguese and English. Its effect upon Mr. Thomas, who was present at the ceremony, was such that his mind lost its balance from sheer thankfulness and joy, and he remained as one insane for the space of a month. One can testify that the years have not been barren, nor the word of God void, when he looks at this single convert standing on the banks of the sacred Ganges at the opening of the century, and turns to another scene which occurred in January, 1876, at Madras, the ordination at one time of *fifteen native preachers*, members of the Church of England.

But as converts were gained, and the Gospel message proclaimed by tract and living voice, Satan cast many hinderances in the way.

The opposition of the Indian Government and of the Court of Directors to missionaries and their work had been gradually increasing, until at last it attained to fever heat. The former came to be regarded as firebrands, who were sowing the seeds of discontent in the country and jeopardizing British rule and authority; the latter as a mischievous attack upon time-honored institutions. This opposition reached a climax when, on the arrival of two new missionaries from England, in August, 1806, they were peremptorily ordered to quite the country immediately. They, like others who had preceded them, promptly placed themselves under the

* Carey, Marshman, and Ward, pp. 60, 61.

special protection of the Danish governor of Serampore, and although the governor-general and his council tried hard to enforce their threat of expulsion, yet they were finally overawed by the firm stand made by the captain of the American vessel which had brought the missionaries, and Colonel Krefting, the governor of Serampore, both promising that the Governments which they represented would call the British Government to account for the tyrannical course its agents in India were adopting.

The result was that the missionaries remained at Serampore and pursued their work.

Speaking of the energies of these pioneer laborers, our author says:—

In no country in the world, and in no period in the history of Christianity, was there ever displayed such an amount of energy in the translation of the sacred Scriptures from their originals into other tongues, as was exhibited by a handful of earnest men in Calcutta and Serampore in the first ten years of the present century. By their own industry, and that of other persons in various parts of India, who had caught from them the inspiration for the work, during this short period, portions of the Bible, chiefly of the New Testament, had been translated, and actually printed in thirty-one Indian languages and dialects. One is amazed, and almost overwhelmed, at the stupendousness of this undertaking. It cannot be supposed that these first attempts are to be compared with the versions which have been subsequently made in these languages. But this must not diminish the intense admiration we ought to feel toward men of such boldness of design, and such astounding energy of execution. Not content with their labors in this direction, they also published a great multitude of tracts, the Serampore press alone issuing them in twenty languages, and, in addition, books for schools and colleges.

The violent opposition from those in authority at last defeated itself and died away:—

In 1812 the Government first ordered two missionaries to be expelled the country, and then all others brought to their notice, excepting, as they always did, the brethren at Serampore. Two missionaries from the United States, the Rev. Messrs. Judson (afterward the "Apostle of Burmah") and Newell, having reached Calcutta, proceeded to the police-office, and stated to the presiding magistrate their purpose to establish a mission to the east of Bengal, at the same time presenting their passports, which they had received from the governor of Massachusetts. Presently six more missionaries arrived, three of whom were British subjects, and three American. Of the five Americans, three, including Messrs. Judson and Newell, were forthwith expelled; but permission, obtained after great entreaty, was allowed them to proceed

to Mauritius. The other two escaped to Bombay, having secretly left Calcutta through the connivance of European residents, who felt outraged at the despotic course the Government was pursuing. But thither they were followed by a peremptory dispatch ordering their immediate deportation to England. Two of the three English missionaries were residing in Serampore, and the third was in the Dutch settlement of Chinsurah. The two former, together with Mr. Robinson, a missionary who had been in India six years, after a long discussion, and after the Serampore brethren had exhausted every effort in trying to overcome the scruples of Government, and to retain them, were ordered to quit the country. Mr. Robinson baffled the authorities, however, by leaving for Java, where he founded a mission. A second was permitted to remain, as it was shown that he could be useful in the literary work of the press. But the third, Mr. Johns, in spite of all protestations, was sent home to England, at an expense to the mission of five hundred pounds. This was the last of the missionary expulsions; for the same year, 1813, in which Mr. Johns was banished from India, was also the year of the new charter which was to remove all restrictions on missionaries entering the country.

One is simply astounded as he turns the pages of the dark record of these years, and sees how fiercely even liberty-loving Englishmen endeavored to prevent missionaries entering India, and also how persistently they encouraged idolatry and other evils native to the land:—

Colonel Stewart, who received the *sobriquet* of Hindu Stewart, resided at Berhampore, where he worshiped idols and the Ganges; he built a temple at Saugur, and on his return to Europe took idols with him to perform *puja*, (worship.) Warren Hastings sent an embassy to the Grand Lama to congratulate him on his *incarnation*. Mr. Lushington, a director of the East India Company, stated publicly in 1793 that "were one hundred thousand natives converted he should hold it as the greatest calamity that could befall India." In the same year a member of the Court of Proprietors declared at the India House that "the sending missionaries into the eastern territories is the most wild, extravagant, expensive, unjustifiable project that was ever suggested by the most visionary speculator; that the project would affect the ultimate security of our eastern possessions." Major Scott Waring wrote in 1805: "I never met with a happier race of men than the Hindus when left to the undisturbed performance of the rites of their own religion; and it might truly be said that if Arcadian happiness ever had existence, it must have been rivaled in Hindustan." *

And this in the days of the funeral pile, the car of Juggernaut, the swinging festival, the horrid Meriah sacrifices, and

* "Hand-book of Bengal Missions," by Rev. J. Long, p. 14.

the merciless, diabolic infanticide! But it was not in India alone that these sentiments were entertained. As late as 1783 the Bishop of St. Asaph stated in the House of Lords that "the obligation said to be incumbent on Christians to promote their faith throughout the world, had ceased with the supernatural gifts which attended the commission of the apostles." Five years later, at a meeting of ministers held at Northampton, Mr. Carey proposed, as the topic of discussion, the duty of Christians to attempt the spread of the Gospel among heathen nations, when Mr. Ryland, Sen., sprang to his feet and denounced the proposition. "Young man," said he, "sit down; when God pleases to convert the heathen, he will do it without your aid or mine."*

Next, after the Baptist missionaries, came those of the London Missionary Society. The first missionary, the Rev. Nathaniel Forsyth, was unable to find a field of labor in the Company's territories, and established himself in Chinsura, under the protection of the liberal government of the Dutch. It was not until 1816 that this society was enabled to establish a mission in Calcutta.

Meanwhile the Serampore missionaries continued their exertions with untiring zeal:—

With the progress of education manifest in every direction they conceived the idea of establishing a college, in which knowledge was to be imparted in English, Hebrew, Greek, Sanskrit, Arabic, Chinese, and a multitude of Indian languages; and lectures were to be delivered by qualified professors in mathematics, medicine, jurisprudence, ethics, and theology. And this brilliant conception they fully carried out. The governor-general of India and the governor of Serampore gave the scheme their sanction and support; and the king of Denmark, with his accustomed generosity, presented the missionaries with a valuable estate, the rent of which was to be appropriated to the expenses of the college, and also granted them a royal charter of incorporation, giving to the college the privilege and authority of conferring literary and honorary degrees. In addition to this central institution for affording a high-class education to the natives, numerous schools were formed in the villages and towns of the neighborhood, containing the enormous number of ten thousand children under the superintendence of Mr. John Marshman, eldest son of the missionary of that name. Moreover, they established a savings bank at Serampore, with the view of teaching the people habits of saving, in contradistinction to the universal custom of extravagant

* Carey, Marshman, and Ward, p. 8.

expenditure prevalent among all classes. Carey also founded at Calcutta an Agricultural and Horticultural Society, which has grown up to be one of the great institutions of the country, and still cherishes with reverence the memory of its distinguished originator.

No history of missionary work in and about Calcutta would be complete without some mention of the great mission colleges which have wisely been founded there, and which have done so much toward the spread of Christianity among the educated classes of the native population. Proper credit is given by the author to Dr. Duff, whom he styles "the great champion of Indian education." This earnest missionary, whose eloquent words have done effective service in the three capitals, London, New York, and Calcutta, left England in October, 1829, and after an eight-months' voyage, during which he was twice shipwrecked, reached Calcutta in May, 1830. With characteristic zeal he at once set to work to carry out the object of the society he represented (that of the Church of Scotland) by establishing "a collegiate institution which should confer the highest education on native youths." Dr. Duff opened the institution on the 12th of July, 1830. "He commenced with five young men, but before the end of the first week he had more than three hundred applicants. Others daily came pouring in, and, consequently, on account of the narrowness of the hall, he was obliged to make a selection from among them. The number selected amounted to two hundred and fifty, with whom the institution was actually opened. A simple, yet thorough course of instruction in the English language for all the classes was laid down, and an hour was devoted daily to the study of the sacred Scriptures in the same language. Strict discipline was also enforced, which was at that day a novelty in native schools. The success of the institution and of its peculiar system of tuition soon became a common topic of conversation in Calcutta both among Europeans and natives. With the latter it achieved a wonderful popularity, which, indeed, it never lost."

It showed both faith in God and a commendable courage when, in 1812, the American Board, then in its infancy, sent to the far East the five missionaries who were destined to be the pioneers of such a noble company, and the founders of

such important missions. They landed at Calcutta in June, 1812, and were at once ordered to depart. As has been seen, two of them, the Rev. S. Nott and the Rev. Gordon Hall, escaping from Calcutta, found their way to Bombay, where they arrived in February, 1813.

They were discovered, however, and a peremptory demand came from the supreme Government to Sir Evan Nepean, the governor of Bombay, to send them to England forthwith. Fortunately for the missionaries, Sir Evan was a man of deep religious feeling, who set an example of Christian conduct to the European residents of the city by his scrupulous attention to religious duties and obligations; and, therefore, instead of treating the missionaries harshly, showed them kindness and sympathy. He received a memorial from them requesting to be allowed to remain in Bombay, and permitted them to continue there, pending a reference which he made to the governor-general in their behalf. The document which he wrote represented the motives and objects of the missionaries so forcibly, that the governor-general was convinced of their integrity and peaceableness, and would have suffered them to take up their residence permanently in Bombay, but at this juncture war broke out between Great Britain and the United States, and consequently a fresh order came to Sir Evan to deport them from the country. Before, however, it could be carried out, they fled secretly in a coasting vessel, intending to proceed to Ceylon, whither they had been invited by the Rev. Mr. Newell, one of their former colleagues in Calcutta, and another missionary. On their way they touched at Cochin, where they dwelt for a month. Meanwhile, the English magistrate, who behaved with them with much consideration, and gave them accommodation gratuitously, received orders from Bombay to send them back. And they returned to Bombay. Sir Evan, although vexed and displeased at their flight, yet showed them all kindness on their return, and provided them with apartments in the Admiralty House. A new governor-general, Lord Moira, arrived in India in October, 1813, to whom the friends of the missionaries in Bengal applied for his sanction to their continuance in India. Sir Evan Nepean also brought the matter before his own council, and was so zealous in it that he wrote home to the Court of Directors in their favor. The decision which they came to was promoted by Mr. Charles Grant, the chairman of the court, who found it difficult to overcome the opposition of some of the members. The directors, in their dispatch, expressed themselves satisfied with the object of the missionaries, and permitted them to remain in Bombay. The mission was at once established, and has continued to the present time.

The missionaries of the American Board were, after a few years, joined by others, (Scotch and English,) and by their

combined earnestness and enthusiasm stirred up a violent opposition. Quoting from Newcomb,* our author says:—

In 1843 the more wealthy Hindus commenced printing by subscription a series of their most popular religious books in monthly numbers. None of these books had ever before been printed, and the manuscripts were scarce and costly, but in the printed form they were afforded at little cost. A Hindu at Bombay expended nearly £400 in printing and circulating one of the sacred books of his religion. Thus a new and extraordinary effort to sustain idolatry showed that the presence and power of Christianity were beginning to be felt. This was still further felt a year later, when the periodical press was, for the first time, brought to the aid of Hinduism. Three weekly newspapers and one monthly magazine, all in the Mahratta language, and bitterly opposed to Christianity, were published at Bombay. A paper was also issued at Poona, and a monthly journal and three weeklies in the Gujeratee language, spoken by seven or eight millions in the region north of Bombay, besides two papers printed in the Persian language. The Gujeratee papers especially attempted to refute Christianity by quotations from the writings of Paine and Voltaire, and other infidels. Thus ten papers and magazines in and around Bombay, armed not only with all that heathen learning could furnish, but with the most approved weapons of infidelity, were brought to bear against the religion taught by the missionaries. But meanwhile the Christian press in Bombay was never more efficient. It had the means of issuing periodicals, tracts, and portions of the Scriptures, in English, Sanskrit, Mahratta, Gujeratee, Hindustani, Persian, and Arabic; and thus the issues of the idolatrous and infidel presses were met face to face, and their influence in great measure counteracted. It was with great joy and thankfulness that the missionaries at Bombay were able to say in 1845, "Thirty-three years ago the doctrine of Christ crucified was unknown to the people of the Mahratta country. No portion of the sacred Scriptures had been given to them in their own language. Not a single tract from which they could learn the way of salvation was in existence. Unbroken darkness covered the land. Now the sound of the Gospel has gone out into all the land. The people of the most distant villages have heard, at least, that 'there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus.'"

One cannot read the chapter devoted to the remarkable spread of the Gospel in the Province of Tinnevelly without being devoutly thankful to God for the triumphs there achieved. "If the same proportion of Protestant Christians which this Province possesses existed throughout India, there would be in

* "Cyclopedia of Missions," p. 386.

the country not less than twelve millions and a half." The records of the last ten years truly show how the word of God can "run and be glorified" even in the midst of the darkest heathenism. This field (Tinnevelly) was visited by Schwartz and Jœnicke about 1788, the latter laboring in it most earnestly and successfully until his death, in 1800. He left "multitudes of people ripe for baptism," and when Gericke visited the province shortly after, in one brief season he baptized one thousand three hundred persons. When he left eighteen new congregations were formed, and the native brethren, carrying on the work which he had commenced, baptized the large number of two thousand seven hundred, thus making in all an increase of four thousand converts. The revival continued; and we read that in five years (from 1820 to 1825) the Christian community was increased by four thousand three hundred persons, who were separated into thirteen circles, with a catechist appointed to each. By 1830 the number of Christians had increased to seven thousand five hundred, belonging to two thousand families, and living in two hundred and forty-four villages; and by 1835 to eleven thousand one hundred and eighty-six persons. Ten years later great general movements of the natives toward Christianity began to take place:—

One was at Sawyerpuram in 1844, "when many villages expressed their desire to receive Christian instruction, and many hundred natives were at once admitted as catechumens." Another was at Christianagram, in which, and at the same time, a similar result to that which had been seen at Sawyerpuram was exhibited. In 1849 there were at the station one thousand five hundred and seventy-nine persons under Christian instruction. So likewise at Edeyenkoody and Nazareth multitudes embraced the Gospel, for we find that by 1850 the former had two thousand Christians, and the latter nearly four thousand.

When the census of 1871 was taken it was found that the native Christians of the various missions of Tinnevelly amounted to fifty-eight thousand eight hundred and forty-one, living in one thousand one hundred and sixteen villages; there were also six hundred and three mission colleges and schools in the province, attended by nineteen thousand two hundred and forty-two pupils. The progress since has been steady and encouraging. The Church of England, whose mis-

sionary work, carried on by two great societies, has spread throughout the land from Cape Comorin to Peshawar, has very properly taken the lead in South India. Its adherents have so largely increased that it has decided to set apart two missionary bishops to superintend its wide-spread operations; and this in addition to three bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, who, like their predecessors, have given more or less attention to the missionary Churches. There is manifest wisdom in this procedure on the part of the mother Church, and it would be well if other episcopal Churches who have marked out, and are carrying forward great campaigns in India, would follow the example. A missionary bishop must be a great unifier of weak, growing, scattered Churches.

Missionary work in the native State of Travancore was commenced in 1806 by the Rev. Mr. Ringeltaube, a German missionary. He visited all the chief cities of that region, baptizing many, both adults and children, and laboring with unwearied devotion. Of this zealous and eccentric missionary the Rev. J. Hough remarks:—

> Scarcely an article of his dress was of European manufacture. He seldom had a coat to his back, except when furnished with one by a friend in his occasional visits to Palamcottah. Expending his stipend upon his poor people, his personal wants seem never to have entered into his thoughts. But simply and heartily as this singular man appeared to be given to the instruction of the poor people while he remained among them, in the year 1815, in the full tide of his useful labors, he suddenly left them, no one seemed to know why, only that something appeared to have come into his strange head of other more hopeful work somewhere to the eastward. While at Madras, whither he went to embark for that place, he called on the Rev. Marmaduke Thompson, with whom he spent an evening, in a very ordinary costume, for he had no coat even then, though about to undertake a voyage to sea. The only covering for his head was something like a straw hat of native manufacture; yet wild as was his appearance, Mr. Thompson was greatly interested in his conversation. No one ever knew whither he went, nor was he heard of again.

The seed thus early and widely, thoroughly scattered, has yielded a rich harvest, and the London Society's missions of Travancore stand second only to those of the Church of England in Tinnevelly. In 1871 they contained thirty-two thousand one hundred and twenty-two native Christians.

In the Province of Cuddapah missionary work was begun as early as 1817, but for near twoscore years the field, though faithfully cultivated, yielded no fruit. The laborers were at length rewarded, and suddenly had the privilege of reaping a great harvest. In this province is a tribe of low-caste Hindus called *Malas.*

They are a degraded race, and worship chiefly rude stone images. In 1851 several villages of these Malas to the north and north-west of Cuddapah became strongly impelled to renounce idol-worship and caste, and to embrace Christianity. After instruction and due preparation many families were baptized. The spirit of inquiry gradually spread to other villages, and in 1853 extended to the Malas in the neighboring Province of Karnool. As an instance of their eagerness and sincerity, some of them inhabiting the villages of Poloor and Jotoor, eighty miles north of Cuddapah, came to that city seeking Christian instruction. "They brought with them their idol, Narku Simhum, an incarnation of Vishnu," says the Rev. E. Porter, "with an umbrella and other paraphernalia of its worship, and surrendered it into the hands of the missionary, saying that they needed instruction in a better way. Two of the head men, after being instructed in the main doctrines of the Christian faith, were, at their earnest request, baptized in the presence of a large congregation. They returned to their village, and through their influence upward of one hundred Malas in the same and neighboring villages came forward and placed themselves under Christian instruction." The year closed with an addition of two hundred and seventy-four persons to the Christian congregations of the mission, most of whom belonged to villages in the country. All these were baptized after a twelvemonth's training, while there were many more remaining as catechumens. In three years eight hundred persons received the rite of baptism.

At Nellore, on the sea-coast, a great religious movement has been witnessed.

A Christian community of more than six thousand six hundred persons has suddenly sprung into existence. In 1861 there were only forty-six Christians in the Province; but in ten years they have increased to the number just stated. Most of them belong to the missions of the American Baptist Missionary Union, which opened a station in Nellore in the year 1840. At the end of ten years only ten converts had been gained, and at the end of twenty-one only twenty-three; but at the end of the next decade, that is, in 1871, this society possessed upward of six thousand four hundred Christians. The seed sown took long to germinate and spring up; but how abundant the fruit! The converts are, as usual, from the lower castes, and it is gratifying to find that as many as

two thousand one hundred and seventy-five are communicants, showing a most healthy condition of the native Church. They are separated into twenty congregations, and are scattered among two hundred and seventy-eight towns and villages, from which it is manifest that the rural population is principally affected. In the year 1871 alone as many as eight hundred and seventy-five persons were admitted into the Christian brotherhood, and the good work is still going on. The schools for the children of the Christians are very few, being only seventeen in all. But the mission has six theological and training schools, a circumstance sufficiently significant, as indicating that the great and pressing want of the missionaries now is properly-trained Christian natives, who shall be able to take charge of congregations, and minister to the religious necessities of both converts and catechumens. They have already prepared a staff of sixty-four Christian preachers and teachers, and one ordained native pastor, which speaks well of their labors in this direction, in as quickly as possible preparing from among the Christians themselves qualified men for the various departments of Christian work which have so recently been formed. But as this work increases other catechists and teachers will be needed, as well also a strong body of ordained native ministers.

One gets an insight into the difficulties which beset missionaries, especially in conducting schools, in the following account of the Free Church (of Scotland) Institution at Madras. This was opened, under the presidency of Mr. Anderson, on April 3, 1837, with fifty-nine scholars, who before the end of the year had increased to two hundred and seventy-seven.

But then it was suddenly broken up by the agency of that hydra-headed monster, Caste. Two Pariah boys had been admitted into the institution. They came spontaneously seeking instruction, and Mr. Anderson felt that, at whatever sacrifices, the principles which he had laid down for his guidance, one of which was the perfect equality of all in the school, must be unswervingly maintained. The despised Parials were accordingly admitted to a full and equal share of all the advantages of the institution. The result was that immediately the school was broken up, and the missionary was left to empty walls and a sorrowful heart. Petitions and deputations from the parents of the late scholars followed. They besought Mr. Anderson to dismiss the hated Pariahs; or, at least, to place them on separate benches, so that their sons might not be polluted. But all was vain. The missionary had taken a stand; he planted himself on the firm rock of principle; and, whatever might be the issue, he was not to be moved. And, as might have been anticipated, he gained the victory. By and by the youths returned. The institution flourished more than ever; and the Pariah and

Brahmin might be seen sitting together on the same bench, learning the same lessons, and struggling together for the mastery.

Of the work carried on in the Province of Arcot by the noble Scudder family, and of the more recent awakening among the Santhals, (begun in 1862,) which has attracted so much attention and awakened so much interest, both in Britain and India, our author gives detailed accounts. He also tells how "step by step Christian missions have been spreading among the hills on the northern flank of the Punjab:"—

More northerly still, in the region of frost and snow, the Moravians (United Brethren) established their mission at Kyelang, in British Lahoul, in 1855. Here, exposed to the intense cold of that region, far away from civilized life, the missionaries have labored in a lofty spirit of self-abnegation from that time to the present. They have translated portions of the Bible, Barth's "Bible Stories," and a Harmony of the Gospels; and have written a grammar, a geography, a short history of the world, and other books, together with several tracts, in the Tibetan language. Most of these works were printed by Mr. Heyde with his own hands, on a lithographic press. They now occupy two stations, and have had the honor and gratification of forming two Christian Churches among the Mongolians.

Besides tracing the gradual spread of missionary work in India from its two starting-points, Tranquebar and Serampore, and taking up the growth of the native Church in the various Provinces and native States, our author does not hesitate to express his own convictions upon various subjects. As he is now about finishing a quarter century of missionary work, his expressions are of weight and his conclusions important. Having had much to do with educational measures, he very naturally indorses, with great warmth, the plan of the Church and Free Church of Scotland, (as well as of the London Society,) of establishing large English schools in the metropolitan cities of the land. He expresses himself plainly on the leading questions connected with the great work, the history of which is recorded in his volume. His views on bazaar-preaching, itinerating, concentration of effort, school-work, medical missionaries, the status of the Native Church, the selection of agents, and the general policy to be observed by missionary societies, are universally approved by the missionaries of the land.

Of course, such a volume has not escaped criticism. The

severest criticism that has appeared is that made in the "Saturday Review," that the style is "Missionese." It has also been urged that the author is too lavish in his praises of the older missionaries; and that such a work should have been prepared by an impartial author, not a missionary. But these are trifling objections. The volume is not extravagant in style, but tells in plain, though glowing language, the progress of the Lord's work in India, connected with which there have been thousands of most thrilling incidents. That the work was needed is shown by its popularity; "it supplies an undoubted want in missionary literature." But few persons in India were as well qualified for the task as Mr. Sherring, his experience having given him a peculiar preparation for it. And we are quite certain that he may be pardoned for glorying in the remarkable industry, the unflagging zeal, and the sublime earnestness of some of his contemporary missionary brethren, especially those advanced in years, like Drs. Duff, Wilson, Mather, Morrison, and others, who gave themselves to India near half a century ago, when coming to India was to the Church at home a hiding one's talent in the earth, and to the authorities here making one's self an unwelcome intermeddler. We would not withhold an iota of the praise due these self-denying veterans, these grand pioneers: it cannot harm them, and it may prove the needed stimulus to those who have come to take their places and carry on the work so well begun by them.

Referring to the conflict between the two systems, Christianity and Hinduism, which has been going steadily forward, Mr. Sherring eloquently says:—

> The aggressive spirit of Christianity has never been more strongly exhibited than in its conflict with the various forms of Hinduism in India during the present century. It has had a wide field to exercise itself upon, and it has entered upon the struggle with its numberless foes with pertinacious eagerness. It has combated superstition in its wildest forms. It has attacked Brahmanism in its famous seats of learning. It has contended with bloody rites, with foolish customs, with caste prejudices. It has followed idolatry to its most sacred spots. The silver sound of the Gospel has been heard wherever the pundit has chanted his *shasters*, and the priest has blown his shell. Within these seventy years the hills and valleys of India have been made to echo and re-echo with the praises of Christ, the Son of God and Saviour of the world. Under

the persistent assaults of Christianity, continued with sustained vigor from year to year, Hinduism has become fairly wearied; and as the range of its attacks and the directness and potency of its strokes increase, the ancient systems of paganism are in all directions showing signs of feebleness and decay. At one time strenuous resistance was shown, and controversy raged throughout the land. But that day is past. Idolatry is not an active foe; and any unusual energy which it may occasionally put forth is necessarily impulsive and transitory. Christianity is looked upon as a young giant with whom it is dangerous to contend, and whom it is best to leave alone.

In the closing chapter of the volume, reviewing the work of these years and the progress made, our author speaks as follows of the direct results achieved:—

They are results which may be tested by any one, for they are tangible and visible. They are scattered over a wide extent of country among the cities, towns, and villages of India, each of which felt, and to some extent yielded to, those elevating and enlightening influences which Christianity, in one or other of its numerous phases, has exerted upon them. The missions exist to make converts, and converts they have made. Every mission has its converts, who are increasing numerically from year to year. Most missions have their schools and colleges; and these, too, are multiplying continually. . . . Almost all schemes of usefulness, having for their object the intellectual, religious, or temporal welfare of the people, have either been originated by the missionaries, or have received their countenance and support. The native Christians are a power in the country; and united with the missions with which they are connected, constitute an ethical agency superior to all other such agencies in the good which they are accomplishing, and are destined to accomplish. The land is spread over with a network of Christian congregations, which, like the stars in the sky, are so many small luminaries shedding light upon the surrounding darkness.

The indirect results of Indian missions are greater and more wonderful still:—

As they were the pioneers in the work of national education, so they continue to the present day in the front rank of this important enterprise. They have striven every-where to civilize the people, and to make them happier in their social relations, more honest one to another, wiser, holier, and better. They have soothed the harshness of foreign rule, and drawn the natives closer to their alien governors. They have awakened the sympathy and secured the confidence of a large portion of the various Hindu races scattered over the peninsula, in a manner and degree surpassing all other humanizing agencies existing in the country. To

them mainly is to be attributed the zeal now exhibited on many sides in the cause of female education and elevation. It is their agents especially who enter zenanas, teach native ladies, and superintend girls' schools, and who are almost the only persons who are intimately acquainted with the domestic life of native women and hold intercourse with them. These missions have loosed the bonds of caste, have made it easier for the lower castes to bear the yoke of the upper, and have resisted strenuously the authority of this inveterate enemy of human society wherever they have been able. They have led many Hindus to abandon idolatry, though they may not have embraced Christianity. By the reflection of the higher spiritual sentiments which they teach on the minds of the people, new religions, molded more or less by Christian truths, have sprung into existence, leading not a few away from superstition to clearer, though it may be not to perfect, views of God and their relations to him. They have brought all India to reverence the Christian religion, and to recognize its lofty, if not its divine, character. They have given essential aid in the abolition of gigantic national evils which filled the earth with horror, such as the burning of widows on the funeral pile of their husbands, female infanticide, drowning the aged in the Ganges, swinging festivals, and many inhuman practices at Juggernaut and elsewhere; and in the introduction of enlightened usages from the West, such as the re-marriage of Hindu widows, and the education and more considerate treatment of women. These Christian laborers have scattered knowledge of every kind, both secular and religious, over the land with marvelous prodigality, have written books, edited newspapers and other journals, and have toiled with unwearied perseverance in the production of an extensive literature in at least twenty spoken languages and dialects.

With our ever-hopeful author we rejoice at the gracious results which God has vouchsafed to his unworthy servants in this land, and we trust that those whose happy privilege it is to-day to preach the great Gospel to the people of India may appropriate the wisdom and shun the mistakes of those who have gone before. May the glory of the Lord cover the face of this mighty land from the mountains to the sea, and make the closing years of the century memorable in the history of India in the salvation of millions of precious souls!

Art. VII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

Baptist Quarterly, July, 1876. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Pioneer Baptist Statesman. 2. Unitarianism in New England. 3. The Messiah. 4. James Cudworth. 5. The Fourth Kingdom. 6. As to Roger Williams. 7. A Retrospect in the Life of Tischendorf. 8. The Sick, and the Prayer of Faith.

Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1876. (Andover.)—1. Natural Basis of our Spiritual Language. 2. Baptismal Regeneration; as Supposed to be Taught in the Words of Jesus: "Born of Water and Spirit." John iii, 5. 3. Jonathan Edwards's Last Will, and the Inventory of his Estate. 4. Recent Works Bearing on the Relation of Science to Religion. 5. A Professorship of Missionary Instruction in our Theological Seminaries. 6. An Exposition of the Original Text of Genesis i and ii. 7. Horæ Samaritanæ; or, a Collection of Various Readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch compared with the Hebrew and other Ancient Versions. 8. Ministerial Education and Training in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Christian Quarterly, July, 1876. (Cincinnati.)—1. Fifty Years of Religious Reformation. 2. The Law of Love. 3. Involution before Evolution. 4. About Law and Sin. 5. The Christ—Whose Son is He? 6. Progress of Ideas. 7. Work and its Conditions. 8. Christianity and Miracles. 9. An Exposition of Revelation VI. 10. Justification by Faith.

Congregational Quarterly, July, 1876. (Boston.)—1. Dexter Clary. 2. Congregationalism in Kansas. 3. David Bacon. 4. Vital Statistics of the Congregational Ministers who Died in 1875. 5. Congregational Necrology.

New Englander, July, 1876. (New Haven.)—1. The Educational Force of Mathematics. 2. European Writers on India. 3. Condillac and the Principle of Identity. 4. The Eleusinian Mysteries. 5. A Record of "The Old Dominion." 6. Logos and Cosmos: Nature as Related to Language. 7. The Unity of the Professions. 8. College Athletics. 9. Fifty Years of Home Missions in Illinois.

New England Historical and Genealogical Register, July, 1876. (Boston.)—1. Memoir of Samuel Adams. 2. Hollis, N. H., in the War of the Revolution. 3. Notes on American History. 4. Letters of Capt. Thomas Mighill of Rowley. 5. Letters and Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Military Men and others during the Revolutionary War. 6. Knox's Diary during his Ticonderoga Expedition. 7. Did the American Colonists desire Independence? 8. Biographical Sketch of Joseph P. Martin, a Revolutionary Soldier. 9. Documents and Letters by Actors in the American Revolution. 10. A Yankee Privateersman in Prison, 1777–79. 11. Sketch of Col. John Allan of Maine. 12. Letter of Capt. John Preble to Col. John Allan. 13. Major-General Henry Knox. 14. Gen. Stark's Horse lost at Bennington. 15. Boston Town Meeting for granting leave to erect Faneuil Hall. 16. Letter of Samuel Paine upon Affairs at Boston in October, 1775. 17. Donations to the People of Boston Suffering under the Port-Bill. 18. Record of the Boston Committee of Correspondence, Inspection and Safety, 1776.

North American Review, July, 1876. (Boston.)—1. The Proposed Charter for the City of Boston. 2. Italian Popular Tales. 3. Houses of the Mound-Builders. 4. Recent Astronomical Progress. 5. The Life of Alexander Hamilton.

Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, July, 1876. (Gettysburgh.)—1. Union of the Humanity and Divinity of Christ. 2. The Genesis of Christian Society. 3. The Mission among the Jews. 4. Two Common Objections. 5. The Lord's Prayer. 6. Lutheran Church Polity. 7. Home Mission Work in the General Synod. 8. The Care of the Young of the Church. 9. Necessities to Manful Life.

SOUTHERN REVIEW. July, 1876. (Baltimore.)—1. The late William Sparrow, D.D. 2. Martin *versus* Tappan. 3. Native Races of the Pacific Coast. 4. Mind and Matter. 5. Manners and Customs of Europe. 6. Java and the Javanese. 7. The Triangular Fight. 8. Taxation of Church Property. 9. Thorvaldsen. 10. A Distinction in Mental Science.

On this Quarterly we have three notes to make: —

1. The editor furnishes a notice of Dr. Myers's book on Disruption, in which he predicates in the course of eleven lines, "wrath," "wormwood and gall," "theological venom," "sectional hate," "venomous," "bile and bitterness," "animosity," "rave," of the editor of this "Quarterly," and announces that he purposes a full article on our book notices of Dr. Myers. We have simply to say, that as Dr. Myers's book was issued to denounce the proposal to "let by-gones be by-gones," and to induce the Southern delegates to make inadmissible conditions of fraternity, our notices of it were written to defeat that aim and secure the presentation of proposals that would attain fraternity. For all our severities of statement that able but uncalled-for book, without which they would never have been uttered, is responsible. We had again and again assured our Southern brethren that we desired oblivion of all unpleasant recollections; we protested against re-quarreling the quarrel; but we had equally assured them that if they came to us with a bill of indictment, they would get one back worth two of it. Dr. Myers, nevertheless, opened his broadside, and we reversed the battery. Whether our notice had any influence in securing our intended result or not we cannot say, but the result has been secured. Dr. Myers's book was defeated. "Let by-gones be by-gones," which he styled "a farce," is the platform, just as we wished. And now if Dr. Bledsoe is pleased to start up and affix a long discussion to the matter, it is certainly his right. But as our interest in the matter ceased when our end was gained, it is very probable that our paper-cutter will not sever the leaves on which his article is printed.

2. Dr. Bledsoe thinks our eternal salvation is in danger from the fact that we have misrepresented him by never stating that he admitted that the right of secession is closed by the late war as a result of "conquest," and he refers to and quotes from a book of his own a passage to the effect that the war terminates the once-existing right of secession. That book is entitled, "Is Jefferson Davis a Traitor?" The editor promises in this num-

ber to send us the book forthwith; but, to prevent all misunderstanding, we here say that it has never been received at this office, and has never been seen by the editor of this "Review;" nor have we ever before seen one syllable giving us notice that Dr. Bledsoe held the question of secession to be closed by the right of war. The very fact that he is obliged to furnish it from his book evinces that it could not be furnished from his "Quarterly." The moment has never been when we should not have been glad to know and to say that such was Dr. Bledsoe's ground. And now, to do justice to all sides, we very cheerfully give Dr. Bledsoe's own words:—

> We did write a book with this title: "Is Davis a Traitor: or was Secession a Constitutional Right *previous to the War of* 1861?" In the Preface of this work we said: "*It is not the design of this book to open the subject of secession.* The subjugation of the Southern States, and their acceptance of the terms dictated by the North, may, if the reader please, be considered as having shifted the Federal Government from the basis of compact to that of conquest; and thereby, [as we have since uniformly held and maintained,] *extinguished every claim to the right of secession for the future.* Not one word in the following pages will at least be found to clash with this supposition or opinion."
>
> No question of moral right can, it is true, be settled by the arbitrament of war; but it is otherwise with questions of constitutional law. Half of the constitutional compacts in Christendom, if not more, have been determined and established by conquest. The Northern theory of the Constitution of 1787, whether tenable or not on the arena of logic, has been definitely established by the war of 1861. The issue was then fought out; the North conquered; and we have since abandoned, in good faith and forever, the right of secession for the future. Hence, in our humble opinion, it becomes our legislators, and statesmen, and politicians, and people, to acquiesce in this decision of the war; and never more think, speak, or dream of the right of secession. What more can we do? We have surrendered the great point in controversy; we have foresworn, for all future time, the right of secession; and we now proclaim the Northern view of the Constitution as the establised and true one for all law-abiding and peace-loving citizens. Is not this enough? Must we admit, not only that we have been beaten in arms, but also in debate?

Most assuredly that is "enough," so long as every thing else said and done is in consistency with it. Every true Northerner would readily offer his hand to the man who *ex animo* says that, meeting magnanimity with magnanimity, and asking that per-

petual peace shall be established on terms of fraternity and equality. Nor do we ask any admission that our Southern brethren have "been beaten in debate," for abundantly did we declare in our notice of Dr. Myers that we asked no adoption by them of our opinions. Let each side hold its own views of the entire past, and seek for a peaceful present and prosperous future for both. Nor is this by any means the first time that we have said in this "Quarterly" that never was a braver people "beaten" in war than the men of the South.

3. Dr. Bledsoe proposes that we either write, or get some one else to write, an answer to his defense of Mr. Davis. It is Dr. Bledsoe's right to defend his associates in the late struggle. It is equally our right to emphasize the present and future rather than the past. And we express the earnest opinion that the sooner such antagonizing defenses cease, the sooner will the North feel free to do generous justice to the great abilities and virtues of men like Richard Henry Lee and Stonewall Jackson.

And now we have a word or two to offer to our editorial brethren generally of the Church, South. Not many months ago, during the Kuklux discussion, we called the attention of the "Nashville Advocate" to the fact that, to the best of our knowledge, there had never been one unequivocal condemnation of Kukluxism in a Southern Methodist paper. Slight disapprovals there had been, but so mixed with apologies, and with curses against the Government and the North, that to any Northerner, and to any Kuklux, it would be apparent that the editor held the outrages to be about right, and was himself at heart a Kuklux. We offered to the editor that if any such unequivocal condemnation could be found and forwarded to our office we would, as an act of justice, publish it. None was forwarded. But there did soon thereafter appear in the "Nashville Advocate" an editorial which, with the disadvantage of appearing to be a consequent of our suggestion, had the advantage of being entirely unequivocal. Soon after the Hamburg massacre there did appear in the Southern and St. Louis Advocates articles unquestionably sincere and likely to be effective. But the following specimen, from the Richmond "Christian Advocate," is one of the kind, above described, that would cheer the heart of a Kuklux:—

The homicide in Hamburgh, S. C., where some colored militia men were killed after surrendering, has met with universal condemnation. The South, however,

is denounced from partisan pulpits and a partisan press for the crime of a few lawless men which all regret and abhor. While we wish prompt and full punishment inflicted upon all bad citizens, we don't forget that the Cotton States are under great provocation to violence. The same irritation from corrupt government would produce an outbreak in the North or West in twenty-four hours.

Now, the effect of all these outbreaks between the two races is destructive to the best interests of the South. They paralyze the prosperity of the South, and consequently of the whole country. They repel the northern immigrant who would otherwise pour his industry into the southern waste places. They drive out northern capital. They turn the national elections into northern victories. The editor of the "Florida Agriculturist" proudly boasts that Florida is the only State in the Union in which real estate is rising in value. For what reasons? She is under the same national government as all the other States. Had she, like Louisiana and Mississippi, indulged in riots, massacres, and general turbulences, led by angry politicians, ecclesiastical and secular, she would have been in the same wretched condition. But she accepted the results of the war, maintained public tranquillity, welcomed the northern immigrant irrespective of hispolitics, turned herself to industrial pursuits, and now she has started on a career of new prosperity. She accepted in good faith the restored government, and she has, consequently, no complaints of oppression by the Government. There is not a Southern State that might not have done the same. Who is to blame? The States themselves; but specially the Southern press, and not least of all the Southern Methodist press. It may be asked, Is not the Government also to blame? Very wrong things, we reply, have in the strifes that have ensued been done by Government agents; but it is the refusal of those States, unlike Florida, to keep the peace which has given rise to these governmental repressions. The Government has dealt rudely with rude opposers. The Government would have been as right in Louisiana as in Florida had Louisiana herself been as right. When the South comes right the Government will be right.

Since most of the above was in print we have received a copy of the Address of the Commissioners of the two Churches to the authorities and members of both. From it we learn the terms on which both Commissions agreed with, as we are informed, perfect unanimity on every point. On the common basis of harmony the following paragraph is explicit:—

As to the status of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and their co-ordinate relation as legitimate branches of Episcopal Methodism, each of said Churches is a legitimate branch of Episcopal Methodism in the United States, having a common origin in the Methodist Episcopal Church organized in 1784; and since the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was consummated in 1845, by the voluntary exercise of the right of the Southern Annual Conferences, ministers and members, to adhere to that Communion, it has been an evangelical Church, reared on scriptural foundations, and her ministers and members, with those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have constituted one Methodist family, though in distinct ecclesiastical connections.

Into the details of the property settlement we need not enter. No property question, of course, can be allowed to stand in the way of the fraternity of the two Churches. In the following congratulatory paragraph we heartily join:—

We cannot restrain the expression of our united congratulations to both of the great Churches, whose commissions we have executed in uniting between them the broken cords of affectionate and brotherly fraternization. Henceforth they may hail each other as from the auxiliary ranks of one great army. The only differences they will foster will be those friendly rivalries that spring from earnest endeavors to further to the utmost the triumphs of the Gospel of Peace. Whatever progress is made by the one Church, or by the other, will occasion general joy. They will rejoice in each other's success as a common good; and, amid the thousand glorious memories of Methodism, they will go forward devoted to their one work of spreading "Scripture holiness over these lands."

And now it would seem that it is in order to think of inaugurating a Centennial Union of all American Methodism, including, if they will, our Canadian brethren. We would say an Ecumenical Union if we supposed that English Methodism would take interest in the movement. It would be graceful in the next General Conference of the Church South to initiate propositions and programme.

Since the above was in type, again, we have read in the "Nashville Advocate" a liberal notice of M'Clintock's life, in which notice the allusions to slavery in the book are reprehended as unfraternal. How far fraternity prohibits any condemnatory allusion to slavery we will not now discuss. No doubt it requires that such allusions should not be made with purpose of direct insult. But as Dr. Summers has repeatedly complained of such allusions in our "Quarterly," we will for the present content ourself with this one reply. So long as the "Southern Review" is allowed to pour forth its broadsides, "under the auspices of the Church South," without protest from the authorities, or rebuke from his fellow-editors, we submit that Dr. Summers has no right to complain of any thing in our "Quarterly," nor of any thing issued under our editorship.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, July, 1876. (London.)—1. The Basis of Religious Belief. 2. The "Unions-Conferenz" at Bonn. 3. Pioneer Presbyterianism. 4. The Progress of Old Testament Studies. 5. Jesus Christ, the Center of History. 6. On Historical Evidence and the Miracle of the Holy Thorn. 7. The Place of Foreign Missions in the Work of the Church. 8. The Cherubim. 9. Priestly Life in Ireland.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1876. (London.)—1. The Illyrian Emperors and their Land. 2. The Unseen Universe. 3. The Revolution and Catholicism. 4. The Independence and Integrity of the Ottoman Empire. 5. Drunkenness and Proposed Remedies. 6. Cycles in Trade. 7. Political Career of Mr. Disraeli.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, July, 1876. (New York: The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 41 Barclay-street.)—1. The Growth of the German Naval Power. 2. Haydon's Correspondence and Table-Talk. 3. Ranke's History of England. 4. The Comte de Paris' Campaign on the Potomac. 5. The Letters and Works of Michael Angelo. 6. Mr. Swinburne's Erechtheus. 7. The Rajpút States of India. 8. Two Chancellors. 9. Moresby's New Guinea and Polynesia. 10. Sir Denis Le Marchant's Memoir of Lord Althorp.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1876. (New York: The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 41 Barclay-street.)—1. Lord Macaulay. 2. Ornamental and Useful Tree-Planting. 3. John Wilson Croker. 4. The Orkneys, and Rude Stone Monuments. 5. Ticknor's Memoirs. 6. Modern Philosophers on the Probable Age of the World. 7. South-Sea Island Mythology. 8. Social Relations of England and America. 9. The Cost of the Navy.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1876. (London.)—1. The Final Document of Revelation. 2. Classical Sanscrit. 3. The Term Ministry in the New Testament. 4. Millbank Penitentiary. 5. The Opium Traffic with China. 6. Benjamin Robert Haydon. 7. Jules Michelet. 8. The Great Social War.

Dr. Rigg, one of the English delegates to our General Conference, presented to that body a topic somewhat obscured under the title "Contagious Disease Act," the momentous importance of which seems not to have been appreciated by our Methodist periodical press, nor by our own mind until the perusal of the last stirring article of this Review entitled *The Great Social War*. It is a subject upon which the American mind has slumbered, because as yet the American people have not been victimized, and are yet unconscious of the approaching danger. That danger is

GOVERNMENTAL LEGALIZATION OF PROSTITUTION.

For eighty years prostitution has been "regulated" in France. No courtesan is by law allowed to ply her trade without license. The whole body of prostitutes is, so far as government power can accomplish it, organized, registered, and placed under a general supervision, who in this country would analogically be styled *Secretary of Prostitution*. The illegal

prostitute is arrested and punished; the institution of prostitutcism is placed upon a respectable basis; the health of the licensed is diligently cared for; and every due effort is used to preserve the self-respect of the sexual practitioner, thus giving the whole system of salable sensuality the position of an organized and recognized profession. The obvious results take place. Marriage and the family are depreciated and demoralized; from respectable families a large number of female recruits enter the registry; clandestine prostitution, instead of being checked, is increased; male sensuality is encouraged and increased, and a gross enslavement of women and degradation of womanhood into an object of impulsive lust are the ever-growing consequences. It is by this route that the base materialism of the age is spreading a gross animalization through Christendom. "O besotted nation," said Alexandre Dumas, "to turn all these lovely women, who should be our companions in life's work—wives and mothers—into prostitutes!" The tendency of the whole system is to transform the men into tyrants and Turks, holding the women in a common harem, collectively supported by public funds, and individually purchasable, while youth and bloom last, by the transient sensualist.

Insidiously and by parliamentary trickery, from the years 1864 to 1869, a junto of villains succeeded in a great degree in inaugurating the same system in England. The same "Contagious Disease Acts" which befogged our Conference deceived the British nation. It was not until near 1870 that British Christians awoke to find that the net was spread over the whole surface of England. An agitation arose unequaled since the days of the abolition contest, the Methodists now, as then, giving a bold lead. But, very suitably, the chief leader in the movement was a woman, Mrs. Josephine E. Butler, of Liverpool, a Quaker lady of rare piety and talent. The British associations in due time found it important to take a survey of the continent of Europe upon this subject, and Mrs. Butler was sent upon that mission. The facts disclosed by her reports form a very important part of the matter. Mrs. Butler met recognition and aid from the noblest Christians and philanthropists of Europe. M. Jules Favre, M. and Madame Jules Simon, Pressensé; and in Italy, Mazzini and Garibaldi,

gave her their heartiest co-operation. The result was the formation of "The British, Continental, and General Federation" for the abolition of government regulation of prostitution. The following extract shows the nature of

The Continental Legalization of Prostitution.

In the summer of 1874, the leaders of the English movement became suddenly aware that their familiar opponents at home were only the advanced guard of a powerful International Medical Congress, which was vehemently demanding an *international* organization of immorality. The first International Medical Congress was held in Paris in 1867. The grave subject before us occupied a chief place in its deliberations, but a standing order of the Congress expressly excluded all moral considerations, and rigidly confined readers and speakers to the purely physical aspects of the question. This arbitrary and violent attempt to separate the inseparable, deprived the deliberations of the Congress of nearly all practical value, but it afforded a striking illustration of the narrow and defective basis on which specialists are ever prone to build conclusions as dangerous as they are far-reaching. The Paris Congress did not commit itself finally to any definite proposals, neither did the second International Congress, which took place at Florence in 1870. It was then resolved, however, that the third International Congress, to be held at Vienna in 1873, should prepare a suggested international law for the sanitary regulation of immorality. This was accordingly done in a paper drawn up by Professor Sigmund, with the assistance of Professors Zeissl and Reder. This document, which was officially signed by the President and General Secretary in the name of the Vienna Congress, is one of the most singular and significant ever issued. It is, in fact, the syllabus of the Infallible Council of the medical priesthood, and, like the syllabus of the infallible pope, it vitally affects freedom and morality. *Inter alia* it demands (1.) That the administration of the suggested law shall be in the hands of the Central Government, municipal and provincial authorities being unfit to carry it out. The friends of local government will notice that this centralized despotism is a striking feature of the existing English Acts. (2.) That the strictest medical surveillance shall be exercised over all organized bodies, such as soldiers, the national and mercantile marine, gendarmes, policemen, and the Civil Service, over the different classes for whom marriage is difficult or impossible, such as domestic servants, and the men employed in factories and workshops, and over all gatherings in which the sexes are mingled, such as pilgrimages, fairs, markets, etc. The male supporters of the English laws may begin to see this question in a new light, when they learn that the doctors of Europe are anxious to inflict upon them those peculiar sanitary attentions which they have so kindly and so chivalrously imposed upon the helpless poor women of England. "With what

measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." (3.) That the fullest printed instructions in reference to the treatment of disease shall be disseminated in every possible way among adults. This proposal to force the foul medical details upon all adults, throws a remarkable light upon the virtuous indignation with which "the obscene literature" of the anti-regulationists has been received. Those who swallow camels generally choke over gnats. (4.) That in any measures taken to heal the sick there shall be nothing of a humiliating character, no penalty, and no trace of condemnation. (*Toutes les mesures prises au début de la maladie, ne doivent avoir aucun caractère d'humiliation, de menace, ou de censure.*) The sufferers, in fact, are to be educated into feeling no more shame or condemnation than the innocent victims of small-pox or scarlet fever. Such is the new morality of which it is hoped every State in Europe will make itself the ardent apostle. (5.) That this is a question which belongs essentially to the medical profession, that therefore there should be in existence a permanent international medical committee, as well as a national committee in every country, and that this elaborately organized medical hierarchy should periodically revise and improve the international law. The exclusive claims of the Ultramontane and every other priesthood are naturally exhibited in this proposition. (6.) That the expenses of the proposed system should be paid out of the State budget, local rates being inadequate to bear the cost. This statement is explained by the last—but not least—proposition, which we propose to quote: (7.) That a "sufficient number" of medical men should be employed, and that they should be "handsomely paid," (*à en avoir suffisamment, a les payer largement.*) The striking resemblance between the Romish and the medical priesthood is completed by this touching and beautiful provision for the collection of a medical Peter's Pence.—Pp. 462–464.

The French Secretary of Prostitution.

Mrs. Butler paid a visit to Lecour, the prefect of the French brothel-police, euphemistically called "Police des Mœurs," of which visit the following extract from a letter to the Right Hon. James Stansfeld gives a graphic account:—

I think I told you that I spent a part of my last afternoon in Paris at the Prefecture of Police. The memory of that interview is so exceedingly painful to me that I feared I should be unfitted for my work if I dwelt upon it. I was struck by the grandeur of the externals of the office, and by the evidence of the irresponsibility and despotic sway over a large class of the people possessed by the man Lecour. I ascended a large stone staircase, with guards placed at intervals, and many people coming and going, apparently desiring audiences. The prefect's outer door is at the top of the staircase, and over it, in conspicuous letters, are engraved the words, "Arrests—Service of Morals," (the arrests being of women only.) In looking at these words, the fact (though I knew it before) came before me with painful vividness, that man, in this nineteenth century, has made woman his degraded slave, by a decree which is heralded in letters of gold, and retains her in slavery by a violent despotism which, if it were applied to men, would soon set all Paris, and not merely a few of its buildings, in flames. The phrase, "*Service des Mœurs*," is the most impudent proclamation of an accepted falsehood. Too

clearly and palpably is the true meaning of it, "*Service de Débauche;*" and M. Lecour's conversation throughout showed and confirmed most powerfully the fact (though he himself may be blind to it) that it is immorality, not morality, for which his office makes provision. I was kept waiting some time in the handsomely-furnished room of the prefect, while he finished his interviews with people who had preceded me. While seated by the fire, with the newspaper in my hand, which had been given to me by a liveried servant, I heard the whole of the conversation (it was impossible not to hear it) which passed. It left a very sorrowful and terrible impression on my mind. An elderly man was there, who appeared to be pleading the cause of a woman, perhaps a near relation, or in some way dear to him. M. Lecour spoke of the woman as one whom he had full power to acquit or condemn, and there was a lightness in his tone which contrasted strikingly with the troubled gravity of the other, who more than once interrupted the volubility of the prefect with the words, spoken in a voice of sullen repressed emotion, "But you have accused her." I thought of the words, "Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained."

Such a power in a merely human, but most awful sense, is possessed by that irresponsible ruler of the women of Paris, but *his* credentials are *not Divine*. Mrs. Butler then gives an account of her own conversation with M. Lecour, in the course of which it was evident that he considered that there is only one guilty party in the sin which is the curse of great cities, and that is the woman; and that the only force with which the criminality on that side can be dealt with is the force which he himself represents. "Always arrests," he said: "more and more arrests. That is the only hope." When Mrs. Butler reminded him of the profligacy of men, and spoke of the male seducers and destroyers of female virtue, he replied with a smile, "Ah! but that belongs to the region of romance. We cannot touch *that*." Mrs. Butler concludes her letter by saying, "As I left his place, I felt oppressed with a great sadness, mingled with horror; and, in thinking of M. Lecour, I recalled the words about "man, dressed in a little brief authority," who "plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven as makes the angels weep;" and not only that, but as make women die, cursing God, in horror and despair.—*Une Voix dans le Desert*, p. 22.

Admitted Increase of Unlicensed Debauchers.

In 1868, Dr. Jeannel, one of the most distinguished physicians in France, the author of many medical works, and an officer of the Legion of Honor, published an erudite and exhaustive work,* the great object of which was to prove that clandestine immorality—*i. e.*, immorality which evades the vigilance of the police and the control of the Government surgeons—was constantly and most dangerously increasing. An equally remarkable book† from the pen of C. J. Lecour—the chief of the first division at the Prefecture of Police, in other words, the head of the French system—entirely confirms the statements of Dr. Jeannel. He declares that, in spite of all his vigilance and energy, clandestine immorality yearly assumes vaster and more menacing proportions. He admits that women whom his lynx-eyed agents utterly fail to catch, are to be found "every-where, in the liquor-shops, the concert-rooms, the theaters, and the balls. One meets them in the public buildings, in the railway stations, and even in the trains. They are on all the promenades, in front of most of the *cafés*. Until a late hour at night they circulate in great numbers in the most beautiful boulevards." Lecour states that there are at least

* *De la Prostitution dans les grandes villes au Dix-neuvième Siècle.*

† *La Prostitution à Paris et à Londres*, 1789–1871

30,000 fallen women in Paris, but that he cannot succeed in bringing more than 5,000 of them into his sanitary net. Dr. Jeannel lays the blame of this hopeless failure upon Lecour and his agents. Lecour, in a recently issued pamphlet,* admits and reaffirms the fact of failure: "I said in 1869, I repeated in 1870: 'Prostitution is increasing, and becomes daily more dangerous to the public health.' Since the Siege and the Commune the evil has assumed such proportions that it has upset all careless indifference." But Lecour indignantly repels the accusation that he and his subordinates are responsible for the breakdown. We will not interfere in this pretty quarrel between the police and the surgeons engaged in the administration of the French system. It is sufficient for us to know that both sides admit the fact that, after a long and full trial, the system in Paris is a gigantic and miserable failure. A similar result has followed similar legislation in every country where the system has existed long enough to produce its natural results.—P. 457.

How the French Commonalty view the Matter.

On her return from the South, Mrs. Butler, accompanied now by M. Humbert, paid a second visit to Paris. Their desire to call a meeting of workmen was abandoned for a profoundly significant reason.

Nothing has interested me so much as the glimpses I have had of the lives and character of the French workmen. There is surely much excellent material there, if it were rightly used. I asked some workmen if they could get together a meeting of their class, to confer on our subject; they told me, and a working man also informed M. Humbert, who made inquiries for me, that it would be easy enough to get a hundred together, (I believe more cannot be called together without the leave of the minister of public instruction,) but that it would be dangerous to do so. And *why*, do you suppose? Because, said these men, out of that hundred there would probably be twenty-five, or thirty, or more, who had a daughter, or a sister, or some one connected with them, in the St. Lazare, or in one of the licensed houses, and that any words spoken on the subject, however cautious, might act like a spark upon a train of gunpowder. When asked, "But how so?" the reply was, "There is too much *hatred*—hatred of the police authorities, and of the whole *régime* which drills the daughters of France, like soldiers, in the service of debauchery." It is evident that many of the blue blouses of the Faubourg St. Antoine, and Belleville Quarter, are honest, sober, home-loving men. How little understood by us in England was the meaning of that noble proclamation of the Commune which, being "hostile to slavery," proclaimed the abolition of every house of prostitution in Paris, and the freedom of the miserable slaves inhabiting them, and which called on the citizens to recognize the necessity for women of freedom to labor with their hands for an honest livelihood. Such an act might "cover a multitude of sins," I think.

We may add that as it was one of the first acts of the grossly misunderstood Communist workmen to abolish licensed prostitution, so it was one of the first acts of the "respectable" Government which superseded them, to restore the infamous system.

* *De l'état actuel de la Prostitution Parisienne.*

St. Lazare the Prison for Unlicensed Prostitutes, etc.

The most important event during Mrs. Butler's second stay in Paris was her visit to the great prison of St. Lazare, the Bastille of the system of vice. St. Lazare is under the immediate administration of the Prefecture of Police. The *eleven hundred* female prisoners with which it is always crowded, are a striking proof of the impotence of the despotic system to furnish licentious men with victims as submissive and abject as they desire. The unhappy inmates of St. Lazare are divided into three classes: 1. Those who have been arrested on suspicion of practicing prostitution without a license, and are either awaiting their trial or have already been condemned for that offense. 2. Licensed prostitutes who have not conformed to the minute regulations contained in their licenses, or who have been found diseased at the periodical medical examination. 3. Young girls imprisoned either conformably to Articles 66 and 67 of the Penal Code, or by request of their parents.*

Mrs. Butler is the first person who has been permitted to reveal some of the secrets of this modern Bastille. Her graphic and heart-rending description is so important, and furnishes such a picture of the impotence, the cruelty, and the wickedness of the system of which St. Lazare is the key-stone, that we must reproduce at length an account which she wrote to a friend:—

I must tell you when we meet of that *world* contained within the walls of St. Lazare. I went to the great prison. Just as I arrived at the stone archway leading out of the street to the big gates of the prison, a huge prison-van rolled in under the arch drawn by stout horses with clattering hoofs, and followed by gensdarmes, also on stout clattering horses, and grandly dressed and armed. The van was on high wheels, and had apparently no window at all; strongly secured, and dismal to look at—like a big hearse, only yellow. People fell back as if rather awed, and the great iron gates rolled open. The cortége rattled in, and in a moment the gates rolled back again. I tried to make my way through the gates in the wake of the prison-van, but there was no time—they closed so quickly, and looked inexorable when shut. What powerful ruffians, do you think—what dangerous strong-sinewed criminals were they conveying with all this show of armed force into the prison? The van contained only a few poor weak, helpless *girls*, guilty of not ministering to impurity in accordance with official rules. O manly, courageous Frenchmen, ever athirst for "glory," how well it looks to see you exercising your brave military spirit against the womanhood of your own country! You cannot be expected to govern your own passions, but you can at least govern by physical force the poor women of your streets, and swagger to your heart's content in your hour of triumph as you proudly enter the prison gates with your trembling caged linnets. But no, miserable men, you cannot even do this; you are beaten by your own women! They cannot meet you on stout horses with helmets and military swagger and police tyranny, but they beat you with other and more deadly weapons. We speak much of women, under the vicious system we oppose, being the slaves of men, and we realize all the tyranny and oppression which has reduced women to so abject a state. But since I have been in Paris I begin to see the picture somewhat reversed, in a strange and awful way. You can understand how the men who have riveted the slavery of women for such degrading ends become, in a generation or two, themselves the greater slaves—not only the slaves of their own enfeebled and corrupted natures, but of

* *La Prostitution à Paris et à Londres.* Par C. J. Lecour.

the women whom they have maddened, hardened, and stamped under foot. Bowing down before the unrestrained dictates of their own lusts, they now bow down also before the tortured and fiendish womanhood which *they have created.* Till now I never fully realized Nemesis in this form. I was reading Whittier's description of an insurrection of negro slaves brutalized by servitude:—

> "And, painted on the blood-red sky,
> Dark, naked arms were tossed on high;
> And round the white man's lordly hall,
> Trod, fierce and free, *the brute he made;*
> Those who, erst, crept along the wall,
> And answered to his lightest call
> With more than spaniel dread—
> The creatures of his lawless beck
> Were trampling on his very neck!"

Just as truly, though it is less perceived, are the men of the modern Babylon, the slaves of the "brute they have made," who is trampling on their very neck, and in fear of whom they plot, and plan, and scheme in vain for their own physical safety. Possessed at times with a sort of stampede of terror, they rush to International Congresses, and forge together more chains for the dreaded wild beast they have so carefully trained, and in their pitiful panic build up fresh barricades between themselves and that womanhood which they proclaim to be a "permanent source of sanitary danger." If it were not too awful, one could almost smile to see these brave men trembling at the very thought of any "female" being at large who is not the property of some man. M. Lecour, in his last book, appears to regard every woman who is not under the immediate rule of some man, as he would a volcano ready to burst forth under his feet. You will see how his terror has driven him to contrive a scheme by which all these terrible single women shall be netted by the police, and held fast. His scheme is too terrible to speak of. Take the case of a man who abuses the good gifts of nature to brutalize himself by excess in wine: that passive agent, in itself unconscious and incapable of motive for good or evil, becomes to him a fiery scourge, a tyrant, and he its slave: "in the end it biteth like a serpent." Much more, and in a far more awful sense, does abused womanhood become the fiery scourge, the torment, and the tyrant of the men who systematically outrage, in her, God's best gift. Just so far as the soul of a woman is above all inanimate things which are susceptible of abuse, so far is the punishment of the man who outrages it increased. It is true he does not become the slave of the woman, but merely of the *female.* Yet, inasmuch as she is not a mere inanimate thing, like intoxicating drink, nor a mere animal, but is endowed with intellect, affections, with responsibility, an immortal spirit, and inasmuch as men have turned *all this to poison,* so is the vengeance suffered by them in exact proportion. The men of this day who are guilty of the deliberate and calculating crime of organizing and regulating the ruin of women, are preparing for themselves an enslavement, an over-mastering terror and tyranny, compared with which the miseries and enslavements brought about by other vices, terrible as these are, are but as the foreshadowing of a reality,—

> "The curse which through long years of crime
> Is gathering, drop by drop, its flood."

Already they cringe, abject slaves of the tyrant they have created; they are ruled, cajoled, outwitted, mocked and scourged by her. They rave at and curse her, as a wretched dipsomaniac will curse his intoxicating drink, madly grasping it all the time; and they will continue to curse until their emasculate race becomes extinct.

The Success of the Abolition Movement.

The progress made since the formation of the Federation is so great that it would require a separate article to relate it. We must satisfy ourselves with the barest outline.

The movement in Italy has surprised the most sanguine. Mem-

bers of the highest aristocracy, such as Prince Francesco Pallavicini, Duke Torlonia, and the Marquis of Cassibile, the professors and students of the universities, and especially the working classes of both sexes, from one end of Italy to the other, have espoused the "holy cause" with astonishing readiness and enthusiasm. Ladies' committees exist in all the principal towns. A majority of the leading journals have pronounced in favor of the movement, and the Left of the Italian Parliament, now in power, have incorporated it into their programme. So extraordinary has been the progress in Italy that Signor Nathan—to whom, as we have already said, it is, humanly speaking, chiefly due—was able to write at the close of last year, "I do not think I could name a single town in Italy in which we have not at present some one working for our cause." It is quite possible that this great country, now rising so gloriously from the dead, may even anticipate England, and be the first European nation to emancipate itself from the fatal servitude of legalized debauchery.

The movement in Switzerland, guided by the organizing genius of M. Humbert, has been especially distinguished by the promptitude with which the *preventive* and *constructive* work of the Federation has been undertaken. Asylums in which destitute and friendless girls will be sheltered from the licentious until suitable employment is found for them, have already been opened at Chaux-de-Fonds, Berne, Lausanne, Geneva, Neuchâtel, Bienne, and Vevey.

A most providential opportunity of inaugurating the movement in Germany occurred last autumn in connection with the seventeenth Congress of the famous "Inner Mission" of the German Evangelical Church. At the special request of the Central Committee of the Inner Mission, the Federation sent a delegate, M. Rollier, to advocate its principles from their conspicuous and commanding platform. There can be little doubt that this vast organization will ultimately marshal its enormous forces in support of the movement in Germany.

The first victories of the Federation have been already won. An effort to introduce the English system into South Australia has been signally defeated, largely through the zealous efforts of Mr. Rowland Rees, M.P. In Cape Colony, where the system had existed for some years, it has, after a prolonged struggle, been totally abolished. The chief promoter of repeal was Mr. Saul Solomon, M.P., a member of the General Council of the Federation.

The *chief interest is now centered in the United States, where bold efforts are being made to introduce the system of vice.* The surviving leaders of the antislavery movement, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, the Hon. Samuel Sewall, Mrs. Lucretia Mott, and other distinguished persons, have already joined the Federation, and are uttering loud protests against the "white slavery." Mr. H. J. Wilson, of Sheffield, and the Rev. J. P. Gledstone, of Chesterfield, have been sent across the Atlantic to encourage and advise the "New Abolitionists" in the States.—P. 475.

For other historical details we must refer our readers to "The New Abolitionists," an important and profoundly interesting volume compiled by Professor James Stuart, of Trinity College, Cambridge, the author of the University extension scheme. All the newspapers called into existence by the movement—"The Shield," "The Medical Inquirer," "The Working Men's League Journal," "The Bulletin Continental," and "The Methodist Protest"—carefully describe the current progress of the Federation.

We conclude our narrative of the Great Social War with the record of one other event. The first Annual Congress of the Federation was held in London on the 19th of last May. It was numerously attended by representatives from every part of the United Kingdom, and by some distinguished foreigners. M. Aimé Humbert was able to report almost incredible progress on the Continent. M. de Pressensé delivered an address of remarkable eloquence and power. Père Hyacinthe had come to England expressly to take part in the Congress, but being prevented by temporary indisposition, he subsequently addressed a crowded audience in St. James's Hall. A valuable letter of adhesion was addressed to the Congress by M. de Laveleye, the distinguished Belgian publicist and political economist. A communication of characteristic spirituality was received from M. Theodore Monod, under whose influence the whole evangelical Protestant Church of France is rallying to the standard of the Federation. But the most significant circumstance of all was the decision of the Federation that it would hold its International Congress next year at Geneva, immediately after the fourth International Medical Congress had concluded its sessions, "so that if our cause gain a victory among the representatives of science, we may be there to gather together and formulate the results of our triumph; or that if a majority of the Medical Congress declare against the work of the Federation, we may be there to give a refutation to their errors on the very morrow of their proclamation, and to at once weaken their deleterious influence on public opinion." Thus already does this young Federation feel itself strong enough to discard mere skirmishes. It enters the international arena and challenges its greatest foe to a pitched battle.—P. 481.

The address of the British Conference on this subject is deeply interesting, and we are amazed that it has, at this present writing, received no attention from our Methodist hebdomadal press. It is signed by the most eminent Methodist names of England—Gervase Smith, Punshon, M'Aulay, Osborne, Jobson, William Arthur, T. Percival Bunting, etc.

But beyond the objects of this federation there opens an awful vista. There are many of our young ministry and laity who are ardently desirous of wreathing their brows with the laurels of REFORM. They have heard what a noble fight it was

the lot of their elders to wage in behalf of humanity and freedom. What ennobling obloquies and dangers did the enviable heroes of that battle endure, and what a victory did they win! O for a battle of similar might! We can tell them there now exists a slavery, in comparison with which negro slavery whitens. The Christianity and the philanthropy of this day are silent over it. Whoever engages in this "new abolitionism" will undergo all the obloquy and hard blows he has stomach for. In 1832, when the abolition battle began its ugly stir, a man by the name of M'Dowell issued a periodical unfolding the abyss of prostitution in our country; but the powerful conservatism which feared any "agitation" akin to abolitionism, joined to the engrossment of all our moral power in the antislavery contest, crushed M'Dowell and his movement. Ever since that the supremacy of old silence has reigned.

It is our lot frequently to ride to our office through one of those streets of New York marked with the reputation of sexual guilt. On a fine sunny morning there beams through the opened window many a fair face looking out as if to catch one whiff of heaven after the night of guilt. Those fair young faces are sign-boards that read, "Woman's Honor for Sale Here." When looking at their images, our thoughts run over the fibers which comprehend the whole vast system of sensuality, debasement, public deterioration, and deep damnation, into one system of which this fair seeming is a glimpse. What a faltering comes upon our heart, followed by a sense of woe and impotence! What can we do? We glide on, we banish the fearful vision from our soul, and pass into the domain of old silence, *with the rest.* Can any hoary sage, can any stalwart *reformer*, any gifted woman, give answer to our ejaculation?

Westminster Review, July, 1876. (New York: The Leonard Scott Publishing Company.)—1. Lord Macaulay. 2. Sunday in England. 3. Early Phases of Civilization. 4. Life of Bishop Gray. 5. Renan's Philosophical Dialogues. 6. Compulsory Medication of Prostitutes by the State. 7. Municipal London.

The third article is a reply to the great work on the "Recent Origin of Man," a volume written by James C. Southall, Esq., of Richmond, Virginia, lately noticed in our Book-Table, and reviewed by Professor Andrews in our present number. As a

refutation the article appears to our judgment a failure, and we hope to furnish a reply to it by Mr. Southall in a future number. In destroying by Mr. Southall and others the validity of peat, stalagmite, flint implements, and language as measures of a stupendous time, the antiquity argument incurs a damage fatal to the reviewer's case. He fatally fails to restore the credit of these measures, and his argument limps at every step.

We have room at present only for a notice of his summary of the cave argument: "The testimony of all the caverns explored, whether in Great Britain, France, Belgium, or the most recent at Kesserloch, is singularly clear and harmonious; they all give, in the most superficial deposits, traces of man for about 2,000 years, and below in cave-earth representing great antiquity, and generally sealed down by a thick bed of stalagmite, man in a much lower stage of civilization, not yet acquainted with the use of metals, and accompanied by animal remains which, if not utterly extinct, have been strangers to Europe since the historic period." So far nothing is proved. Fling out the mere assertion "representing great antiquity," and the reliability of stalagmite, and you have nothing but a few animals doubtfully "extinct" since the Roman period. Nothing beyond 2,500 years ago is proved, if even that; but we will "donate" 500 more, and say 3,000. But the review proceeds: "Sometimes, as in Kent's Cavern, there is a lower and thicker bed of stalagmite, with traces of others still more ancient, and beneath, another bed of cave-earth of different structure, yet in this lowest-known bed man appears in a still more savage state, accompanied by animals most of which are wholly *extinct.* It is this unvarying record of the antiquity and gradual progression of man through the three ages, confirmed by the deposits in peat-mosses, in ancient forest-beds as at Cromer, and of river-drift, all proving extensive changes both geographical and geological since the advent of man, that must be met and controverted by those who hold the views of Mr. Southall." Now we are able for all this to assign a thousand years more since the flood, or near two thousand additionally before the flood. Nor do all his extinct animals, peat-mosses, river-drift, or flint tools, carry the antiquity beyond that period.

As to flint implements, Mr. Southall shows that the rough and smooth were used in the same age; that they are often mixed together; that there is no definite boundary line; and that in the notable instance of Schliemann's Troy, the smoother implements were found in the older strata. Now we submit that the pretense that these gentlemen can judge of the time taken to pass from a rough to a smooth stone, borders so nearly on charlatanry that it should be banished from any thing that claims to be science.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1876. Third Number.—*Essays:* 1. RÖSCH, The Jesus Myths of the Islam. 2. SCHMIDT, The Ethical Aspect of the Present Conflict of the Biblical and Modern Theological Views. 3. LECHLER, The Conversion of the Germans to Christ, in its Historical Progress. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. STRACK, The Manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible in St. Petersburgh. 2. SEIDEMANN, A Contribution to the History of the Reformation. 3. HARNACK, Remarks on Heb. ix, 3, 4. *Reviews:* 1. GEBHARD, Graecus Venetus, reviewed by KAMPHAUSEN. 2. CHRISTLIEB, Collection of Essays and Treatises by Dr. Hundeshagen, reviewed by RIEHM.

Professor Lechler, of Leipzic, the author of the excellent work on Wiclif, gives in the third article a summary review of the course and progress of the conversion of Germany to Christianity, from its beginning in the second to its completion in the thirteenth century. The first mention of Christian Churches in Germany he finds in the work of Irenæus, the famous Bishop of Lyons. The circumstance that the Bishop of Lyons, who himself was a native Greek of Asia Minor, was the first to mention Christian Churches in Germany, is, according to Lechler, not without significance; for it is probable that the first impulse to the establishment of a Christian congregation in the valley of the Rhine proceeded from the valley of the Rhone, which again received the germs of Christianity not from Rome or Italy, but, by way of Marseilles, from Asia Minor. This view receives a curious illustration by the German word *kirche*, (church.) This word has not taken its way through the Latin Church language, as the words *église*, (French,) *chiesa*, (Ital.,) etc., which the Romanic nations have derived from the Latin *ecclesia*, but it comes directly from the Greek κυριακόν. On closing his survey of the history of the conversion of Germany, the author calls attention to a few

notable facts. It took the Christian missionaries more than eleven hundred years to complete the conversion of the countries which at present constitute the German empire. Such a fact should be borne in mind by those who rashly accuse modern missions of barrenness, because they do not complete the Christianization of vast countries within a few years. The missionaries who labored in Germany were from all parts of the world—from France, Italy, Ireland, England, the Byzantine empire—and the congregations formed by them of course showed traces of these various influences. This variety gave to the piety and culture of Christian Germany that character of universality which distinguishes it. Finally, the German people became for the first time united through their conversion to Christianity. The Germans should mind this important fact. By nature they have a strongly particularistic, centrifugal tendency. It is only the Christian religion which has brought them together and can keep them together.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) Edited by Dr. RIEHM and Dr. KÖSTLIN. 1876. Fourth Number. *Essays:* 1. SMEND, The Condition of the Israelitish Religion in the Eighth Century B.C. 2. FÖRSTER, The Boniface Question. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. JACOBI, The two Epistles of Clement of Rome. 2. SEIDEMANN, Documents Relating to the History of the Reformation. *Reviews:* 1. HASE, History of Jesus, reviewed by BEYSCHLAG. 2. HILGENFELD, Introduction into the New Testament, and BLEEK, Introduction into the New Testament reviewed by SCHURER.

By the title "Boniface Question," the author of the second article understands an inquiry into the Christian character of the British monk Winfried, who is better known in Church history under the name of St. Boniface. The Church of Rome has enrolled him in the number of saints, and has conferred upon him the name of Apostle of Germany. It is, therefore, natural that all Roman Catholic historians should extol him as a missionary of extraordinary merit, and that even Protestant writers should regard him with a kind of national patriotism, as a Christian of excellent character, whose subserviency to Rome should be excused by the condition of those times. Rettberg, in his Church history of Germany, Kurtz, Neander, and Gieseler, are mentioned among the historians of the highest rank who still adhere to this traditional view of the character of Boniface, to which quite recently one of the greatest novel writers of Germany, Gustav Freitag, (in his *Ahnenbilder,*) has secured a new popularity. This traditional view of

Boniface is, however, most strenuously opposed by two Protestant writers of note, Dr. Ebrard, in his work on the "Iro-Scottish Missionary Church," (*Die iro-schottische Missionskirche*, 1873), and A. Werner, in a new biography of Boniface, (*Bonifacius, der Apostel der Deutschen*, 1876,) who undertook to prove that whatever merit Boniface, for his zealous efforts in behalf of Rome, may have in the eyes of Roman Catholics, there is nothing in either his character or his work which entitles him to that high esteem on the part of Protestants which thus far has been prevailing in Protestant literature. The chief arguments of these two writers are presented, in a condensed form, by the author of the above article in the *Studien*, who also takes care to explain his own views whenever they differ from either of the two writers. The subject is divided into five sections, treating (1) of Christianity in Germany before the Roman invasion; (2) of the plan and aim of Boniface; (3) of his Church polity and position with regard to Rome; (4) his relation to political questions and the State authorities; (5) his character.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Edited by Dr. HILGENFELD. 1876. Third Number. 1. THOMA, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. 2. TOLLIN, Servetus's Doctrine of Satan. 3. HARMSEN, Is Christ Represented in Rom. xi, and 1 Cor. viii, as Mediator of the Creation of the World? 4. RÖNSCH, Contributions to a History of the Itala. 5. GÖRRES, Miscellaneous Contributions to Church History. 6. HILGENFELD, The Complete Latin Version of Ezra.

The author of the second article informs us that he has been for eighteen years devoted to the study of the works of Michael Servetus, the famous theologian and physician of the sixteenth century, who, on account of his heretical views on the doctrine of the Trinity, was burned at Geneva by order of Calvin. Tollin has published, in several German journals of theology, valuable articles on important points in the life of Servetus, the contents of some of which have been noticed in our synopsis of German reviews in former numbers of the Methodist Quarterly Review. According to Tollin, the idea now prevailing that Servetus, because he was burned as a heretic by order of Calvin, must have been a kind of free-thinker, is altogether unfounded; on the contrary, he was as firm a believer in the Bible as any Protestant that ever lived, and measured even every new scientific theory by its agreement or non-agreement with the Bible word. He believed in the existence of a Satan

because he found it taught in the Bible. His speculations on this subject, which are here given at great length, are of less interest than the entire character of the man on whom, it seems, we may expect, ere long, a special work of value from the author of this article.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. (Journal for Church History.) Edited by Dr. Brieger. *Treatises and Essays:* 1. GASS. On the Significance of the Historical Sense. 2. PIPER, Contributions to a History of the Church Fathers from Epigraphic Sources. 3. HARNACK, On the so-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, (First Article.) *Critical Reviews:* MÖLLER, Works on Church History published during the year 1875. II. History of the Church from 325 to 768. —*Analecta.* 1. GEBHARDT, Remarks on the Text of the recently discovered Fragments of Clement. 2. RÖNSCH, On the Last Sentence of the Muratori Fragment. 3. RÖHRICHT, Bibliographical Contributions to a History of the Flagellants. 4. An Unpublished Epistle of Luther. 5. A Memorial of the Cardinal of Lorraine on the Ecclesiastical Condition of France, (1563.)

The Journal for Church History continues in this number the very valuable review of all the works on Church history published in the year 1875. This second article (by Prof. Möller) treats of the works relating to the history of the Church from 325 to 768. The praise which we have bestowed upon the first part of this review in the July number (p. 538) of our Review is also due to this second part; only it seems that the number of non-German works reviewed is still smaller than in the first part.

The great theological discovery of the year 1875, the first complete Codex of the Second Epistle of Clement, (see *Meth. Quarterly Review*, 1876, p. 543,) keeps the theological periodicals of Germany very busy. With remarkable unanimity the writers on the subject agree that now, when we have for the first time a complete copy of this important work, it is clearly shown not to have been an epistle, but a homily. Prof. Harnack, who had but shortly before the discovery of the new Codex, in his edition of the "Apostolic Fathers," declared in favor of another view, now fully concurs in the new theory. The discoverer of the Codex, Archbishop Bryennios, regards the homily as a genuine work of Clemens. If this were correct, we should now have a complete Christian homily of a much earlier date than was formerly supposed—a fact of great importance, for it would improve our knowledge of the homily as a part of the Christian worship in the earliest Church. Professor Harnack, in the article above quoted, enters into a very thorough investigation of the questions about the origin and authorship of the homily. The result at which he arrives will be given in his next article.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) May, 1876.—1. A French Quaker. 2. CADENE, The Two Ampère, according to their Correspondence. 3. STAFFER, Contemporaneous German Theology, by Astié.
June.—1. RECOLIN, The Tower of Constance at Aignes-Mortes. 2. CADÈNE, The Two Ampère, according to their Correspondence. (2d Article.)
July.—1. SABATIER, The Present State of the Critical Question Relative to the Fourth Gospel. 2. MEYER, Public Instruction in the United States.
August.—1. PRESSENSÉ, Ecclesiastical, Religious, and Moral Life of the Christians in the Second and Third Centuries. 2. MONOD, The Fine Arts in 1876. 3. BOUFFET, Art and Ethics in Literature.

About one half of the articles in the above four numbers contain the substance of new and important French works. Thus the first article gives, according to a French translation of an English work, a full sketch of the philanthropic and missionary labors of Stephen Grellet, one of the most zealous missionaries of the Society of Friends in the present century, who, though a Frenchman by birth, was by the work of his life an American. The book of Astié, on the recent theological literature of Germany, (*La Théologie Allemande Contemporaine*, Geneva, 1875,) is one well suited to give non-Germans an idea of the wonderful literary productivity of German theology. The work consists chiefly of articles reprinted from a monthly periodical of Protestant theology, published in one of the French cantons of Switzerland, (*Revue de Théologie et de Philosophy*,) of which Professor Astié is one of the editors, and which devotes the larger portion of its columns to a full account of the important theological literature of the day. The first article of the July number, in reviewing the second edition of a French Protestant commentary to the Gospel of St. John by Godet, (*Commentaire de l'Evangile de Saint Jean*, 1876,) gives a history of the discussion concerning the authenticity of the fourth Gospel from the time when Baur, the father of the Tübingen school, in his *Critical Researches on the Canonical Gospels*, (1847,) attacked it. In the first article of the August number, E. de Pressensé gives us a chapter of the sixth and last volume of his history of three first centuries of the Church, which will soon appear, and be wholly devoted to the ecclesiastical, religious, and moral life of the Christians in the second and third centuries. The work of Pressensé has long ago secured an honorable and prominent position in the

Protestant theological literature of Europe. The article on public instruction in the United States, by J. Meyer, presents a very large number of statistical facts, chiefly derived from Hippeau's *l'Instruction Publique aux Etats Unies*, and finds many things in the American school system to admire, and a few to regret. The statement of the general features of our school system are, on the whole, correct, though in the details there are some amusing blunders; thus we read (p. 427) that *Haward* (the author always writes this way) College owes its origin to the liberality of Ezra Cornell.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

OLD CATHOLICS.

The old Catholic Church has now completed its organization in Switzerland as fully as in Germany. The Federal Council having sanctioned the establishment of a Christian Catholic Bishopric for Switzerland, (the Swiss having adopted this name in preference to Old Catholic,) the National Synod of the Church convened at Olten, in the Canton of Solothurn, and elected Dr. Edward Herzog, pastor of the congregation of Berne and Professor of Catholic Theology at the university of the same city, as first bishop. Dr. Herzog at first declined the offered dignity, but finally yielded to the urgent and unanimous entreaties of the Synod. He is only thirty-four years of age, and regarded as a man of great scholarship as well as executive ability, and it is hoped that he will succeed in infusing new life into the movement, and in settling the differences which have manifested themselves in Geneva, and greatly injured the progress of the cause. Father Hyacinthe, who had withdrawn in disgust from the movement in Geneva, which he reproved as being political rather than religious, has offered his services to the bishop elect. From the statistical report made to the Synod of Olten, it appears that the membership of the Church in little Switzerland already exceeds that of the German Church. There were at the time of the Synod fifty-five organized congregations with resident priests, and twenty-five societies which are as yet without priests. The total membership of the Church amounted to seventy-three thousand three hundred and eighty persons. Of the reorganized congregations twenty-five are in the Canton of Berne, seven in that of Aargau, three in Solothurn, and eleven in Geneva. Fourteen of the twenty-two cantons are as yet without either congregation or society, although none of them are without sympathizers. The accessions of several large congregations to the movement is soon expected, as the majority of the members have emphatically

rejected the Vatican decrees. It is noteworthy that in the largest Catholic city of Switzerland (Lucerne) the Christian Catholics are in a decided majority, and expect, by the election of a Christian Catholic Church Council, to retain the possession of the church property. Thus the prospects of the Church are regarded as very hopeful. The resolutions passed by the Synod indicate that there is a full agreement in all essential points with the Old Catholics of Germany, though the Swiss appear to be more resolute and determined in the introduction of reforms. The Synod greeted the union which the Old Catholic Church of Germany is striving to restore with the Protestant Churches and the Greek and Anglican Churches as "a great work longed for by the founders of the Christian religion," and pledged its hearty co-operation with the movement. The Synod declared that it acknowledged "as the sole head of the Church Jesus Christ, under whom she governs herself autonomously in association with her episcopate, priesthood, and diaconate" —and "as ecumenical Church assemblies only the seven councils recognized as such by the undivided Church of East and West." The use of the national language was declared to be permissible at the celebration of the mass, and to be in accordance with Christian antiquity, and a committee was charged with the editing of a ritual and missal in the German and French languages. It was further declared that the obligation to confess at least once a year, introduced in 1216 by the Fourth Lateran Synod, was not regarded by the Synod as binding, and that each man must decide, after conscientious self-examination, whether the reception of the sacrament of penance before the communion is necessary or advisable for him. In regard to the troublesome question of priestly celibacy, it was declared that the capacity for holding spiritual offices is not dependent on the question whether the priest concerned is married or unmarried. The Catholic University, which the Government of Berne has established for the Old Catholics in connection with the University of Berne, has gained an important acquisition by the appointment of Abbé Michaud as professor. The abbé has been, with Father Hyacinthe, the foremost representative of the Old Catholic interests in France, and has probably written more in explanation and defense of the movement than any other writer. His efforts to establish Old Catholic congregations in France have been unsuccessful. In his recent position as professor of theology he is believed to have a more congenial and promising field for his activity.

In Germany the Old Catholic Synod, which met, as usual, at Bonn, under the presidency of Bishop Reinkens, again reported a considerable progress of the Church during the past year. Ahead of all the other States is the Grand Duchy of Baden, which has gained ten new congregations, six priests, and two thousand two hundred and ten adherents. Prussia and Hesse have established two new congregations each, and Oldenburg one. The total number of congregations and societies at present is, in Baden forty-four, in Prussia thirty-five, in Bavaria thirty-one, in Hesse five, in Oldenburg two, in Würtemberg one. Leaving out Bavaria,

where the existing unfavorable circumstances make it impossible to give exact figures, the numbers were as follows:—

	1876.	1875.	Increase.
Congregations	87	72	15
Families	12,129	10,761	1,368
Individuals	39,241	34,737	4,504

In Bavaria there were reported: In 1876, families three thousand five hundred and eighty-one, individuals ten thousand one hundred and ten; in 1875, families three thousand five hundred and five, individuals ten thousand one hundred and eighty-nine; increase, families seventy-six; decrease, individuals seventy-nine. The number of congregations has also slightly increased. Three priests were ordained during the year, four hundred and twenty-seven persons confirmed, and nine Old Catholic students were studying at the University of Bonn. The most interesting question which this year's Synod had to discuss and dispose of was the abolition of priestly celibacy. About twenty congregations and seventeen priests had presented a motion for its immediate abolition. The most prominent layman of the Church, Dr. Schulte, had published in the course of the year a pamphlet strongly condemning the principle of enforced celibacy. Among both the clergy and the laity the general disposition appears to be altogether in favor of abolition. Nevertheless, the synodal representation reported against the abolition, and the Synod concurred in this report by the overwhelming majority of ninety-five ayes against only eight noes. This result, it was stated, was chiefly due to the influence of Döllinger and a few other prominent leaders, some of them having even threatened to withdraw from the movement in case the Synod should yield to the clamor against celibacy. The only concession which was made was the permission that Old Catholic priests, after resigning the ecclesiatical functions, may enter the state of marriage.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The Roman Catholic Church of Germany has lost many of her prominent scholars (as Döllinger, Reinkens, Schulte, Reusch, and a host of others) by the Old Catholic movement. Still there remains in her a greater literary activity than in any other Roman Catholic country. In honor of the centenary birth-day of Joseph Görres, (born January, 1776.) whom they regard as one of the greatest scholars of their Church in the present century, the Roman Catholics of Germany have founded a "Görres Association for the Advancement of Science in Catholic Germany." The Association has offered two prizes each for the best works on the following subjects: 1. A history of St. Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans; 2. A history of German Philosophy since Kant; 3. A biography of Albertus Magnus. The first work must be presented to the

Association in March, 1878; the second in March, 1879; the third in March, 1880. It is likely that although undertaken in the interest of the Roman Catholic Church, this enterprise will call forth some good works that will fill a gap in theological literature. Thus a good biography of Albertus Magnus, one of the greatest theologians of the Middle Ages, has long been felt as a real want.

The State Church system still has many advocates in Germany, but it is rare to meet with such extreme views as are contained in a work by Constantine Rössler on the German empire and the ecclesiastical question, (*Das deutsche Reich und die Kirchliche Frage*, Leips., 1876.) According to this author, the modern state must resolutely make use of the *jus reformandi* which the Reformation of the sixteenth century conferred upon the Government, and it must remember that it is all powerful by means of the school. The State must govern the Church, as it governs all great interests which are dependent upon it. It must revise the confessions of faith, introduce uniform catechisms prepared according to its directions, and submit the clergy to a rigorous discipline. In the liturgy of the Protestant Church the author intends to substitute music for preaching.

Dr. Hausrath, Professor of Theology at Heidelberg, has begun a work on "*David Friedrich Strauss* and the Theology of his Times." It will contain two volumes, the first of which has appeared, (Heidelberg, 1876.) The first volume is divided into four sections: 1. The life of Strauss previous to the publication of the Life of Jesus; 2. The Life of Jesus; 3. The controversy concerning the Life of Jesus; 4. The call of Strauss as Professor of Theology of Zurich. An appendix gives several interesting documents, among them the report of the theological Faculty of Zurich on the appointment of Dr. Strauss. The author, though belonging himself to an advanced rationalistic school of German theologians, thinks that the appointment of Strauss in a theological Faculty cannot be justified, and that he, if a member of the Faculty, should have voted against it.

A work on the origin of the doubtful writings of the Apostolic Fathers, (*Patrologische Untersuchungen*,) by Constantin Sworzov, professor of patrology at the Academy of Kiev, which has appeared in the German language at Leipsic, is especially interesting as a proof of the progress of theological studies in Russia. The work treats of the origin of the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the second Epistle of Clemens, the Epistle of Ignatius, and the so-called Areopagite writings. The first Epistle of Clemens and Epistle of Polycarpus are not embraced within the scope of his researches, as these two writings were generally recognized in the ancient Churches as genuine. According to the author, the Epistle of Barnabas was written during the persecution of Domitian, in 91; the Shepherd of Hermas, under Antonnius Pius, against the Gnostic Mark; the second Epistle of Clemens is regarded as a circular epistle really written by Clemens Romanus. The Ignatian epistles are all regarded as spurious, and as having been written by an opponent of the

Marcionites in Rome between 158 and 169. The works, which have been named after Dionysius the Areopagite, the author ascribes to Dionysius the Great, of Alexandria.

FRANCE.

Prof. Lichtenberger, formerly of the Theological Faculty of Strassburg, has engaged, with a number of other Protestant theologians of France, in the publication of the first Protestant Theological Cyclopedia of his country. It will appear under the title, *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses*, and embrace from ten to twelve volumes of 800 pages each. It is issued in numbers of 160 pages each, the first of which was ready in August. The publisher promises the publication of about two volumes a year. The prospectus announces that the large German Cyclopedia by Herzog will serve as model.

The biographical dictionaries of celebrated French Protestants by the Brothers Haag (*La France Protestante*) will appear in a second revised edition. The first edition contained eight volumes, the second will contain about twelve, of 900 pages each. The first half of the first volume has appeared, and contains the articles from *A* to *Antiqué*.

Pastor Bersier, of Paris, one of the greatest pulpit orators of Protestant France, has published the fifth volume of his *Sermons*, and a new edition of the liturgy of the Reformed Church, (*Liturgie à l'usage des églises réformées.*)

The Roman Catholic literature of France, considering the large membership of the Church, and comparing it with that of Germany, is remarkably insignificant. As a Church historian Abbé Martin has obtained some distinction. He is the author of a life of John Chrysostom, (*Jean Chrysostome*, etc., 3 vols., Paris, 1875.) He has also published a valuable work on the so-called Robber Synod (*Latrocinium*) of Ephesus, (*Le Pseudo-Synode connu dans l'histoire sous le nom de Brigandage d'Ephèse*, Paris, 1875.) Entirely new light has been shed on the history of this Synod, which is of considerable importance in the early history of the Church, by the recent discovery of the acts of this Synod in Syriac. The original Syriac with the English version have been published in England by S. G. F. Perry, and a German translation by Dr. Hoffmann. Abbé Martin himself had published, in 1874, a French translation of the Acts, and (in the *Revue des questions historiques*) an article on their contents. Abbé Pujol has published the first volume of a work on "*Edmond Richer*," (Paris, 1876,) and the renewal of Gallicanism at the beginning of the 17th century. A second volume will complete the work. A new effort to misuse some passages of the New Testament and Church Fathers for proving the doctrine of papal infallibility has been made by the Archbishop of Bourges. His work on the subject (*La Tradition Catholique sur l'infallibilité pontificale*, Paris, 1876) will comprise three volumes, the first of which has appeared. A history of the Roman Popes (*Histoire des souverains pontifes*, Tournay, 1876) has been published in one volume by Bourgeois.

Art. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Holy Bible. With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary. (Speaker's Commentary.) Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. IV. Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon. 8vo., pp. 702. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1874.

The book of Job, as all at the present day admit, is a poem. The rhythm of the dialogue, and its transcendent imagery and elevation of style, demonstrate it to be didactic poetry. The narrative is framed for and subjected to the doctrine, not the doctrine to the narrative. The poem has, indeed, a prose prologue and epilogue; but even this prose is poetic in spirit. It has ideality overlying the reality. It abounds with arithmetical exactnesses that never occur in real life. So that the whole book is a poem, partly in rhythmical and partly in prose form, having yet a basis in history. Our own deep impressions are that the time both of its events and its composition is Mosaic or pre-Mosaic. Its purpose in the canon is to present a view of patriarchal theology.

It is not difficult, perhaps, to draw a clear boundary line between the history and the overlying ideality. Job's residence is fixed with so literal a definiteness that the geographer, even at the present day, is able to identify it. His own name, and the name of his friends, possess no allegorical meaning, (like those in "Pilgrim's Progress," for instance,) and seem to be literal. The residences of his friends are literally geographical, indicating that they were real persons. The greatness, goodness, and misfortunes of Job, not with the arithmetical coincidences given, but so marked as to render him a signal instance of suffering goodness, were doubtless historical. We may suppose a high debate on the reality of human goodness, and the relation of evil and suffering to that goodness, to have taken place between Job and his friends. But as soon as we commence the rhythmical dialogue we see that it is raised above all human colloquy. Not only the rhythm, but the sublimity, the divine elevation of thought, demonstrate the literal unreality. Four such sublime geniuses as the historical theory makes of our Job and his friends never met on earth. There never lived but one such genius, and that is the "great unknown," the author. And then, if we turn to the epilogue and prologue we find a plane above the level of human life. Job's children are ten; his sons and daughters are the exact sacred numbers *seven* and *three*. His sheep and camels are also *seven* and *three*

thousands. His oxen and asses are both just half a thousand. On his restoration the numbers of his stock are just doubled, and his wife furnishes him exactly as many children as he had lost. All this is not only poetical, but arithmetical justice. The events as they occur have, also, a certain panoramic exactness. The four announcements to Job are made by the escaping messengers with a dramatic successiveness and sameness of verbal formula. And the demeanor of Job's visitors at the close of the second chapter has a statuesque formality and grandeur. There is nothing so picturesque as their entire silence for just seven days. As in the Apocalypse, seven and three are the favorite numbers. Doubtless some of these instances of artificiality could be by themselves explained; but the instances are too numerous for doubt as to the whole.

It will follow from all this that the vision of God and Satan in the supermundane council of God with his sons, of God interrupting the conversers by a voice from the whirlwind, and of God pronouncing final condemnation on the errorists in the debate, is not a historic reality, but an apocalyptic presentation. This presents truth in image and symbol. And believing, as we do, with the Church of God in past ages, that the writer was an inspired teacher, we hold that the doctrine these symbols image forth is an authoritative doctrine. It was not, indeed, his ultimate purpose to *prove* the theodicie doctrine of the book, but to *exhibit* it in a divine apocalypsis.

Some writers maintain the literality of the converse of Elohim and Satan and the poetic speeches of Jehovah not so much by any argument as by imputation of "rationalism" to the reverse view. But an interpretation is not rationalistic because rationalists have advocated it; nor do we maintain it from any rationalistic proclivity. Wherever miracle is narrated in the Bible with clear historical intent we accept it. The theophanies disclosed to Abram, the rebuke of Balaam, the temptation of Christ, we accept literally because they each occur in the level plane of prosaic history. But the cosmogony of the first chapter of Genesis, the supernaturalisms of Job, and the Apocalypse of John, furnish us, in different degrees yet clearly, with such fair warnings, by their poetic rhythm, symbolical numerals, artificial exactnesses of events, and panoramic imageries, of being not history but a divine apologue, that our interpretation is based on the plainest laws of exegesis, and fully accordant with the spirit of the evangelic Church.

The theme is the true existence, position, and value of human

goodness or piety in the world. The question is: Is there a human virtue which, in spite of adversities and failings, may still claim God for its trust and Saviour? The issue is between God and Job in the affirmative, against Satan and Job's friends in the negative. God affirms its true existence, as in the instance of Job; Satan denies its reality; and the friends of Job accordantly with Satan affirm, 1. That for Job to profess piety is presumption before God; and, 2. That his great calamities prove him a sinner. They are refuted thus:—

Satan's denial is refuted by Job's persistence in piety in spite of great suffering; by Job's own unshaken profession, and by God's final approval.

The friends of Job are refuted, 1. By God's affirming that Job's piety could not stand before the absolute, but is valid after the permitted standard of probationary humanity; 2. By, triply, the structure of the narrative which reveals Job's sufferings to be divinely permitted and diabolically inflicted *trials;* by Job's triumphant maintenance of his profession through the whole as pure, not before God, but before man; and by God's final decision in his favor and his restoration to peace and prosperity.

We may, therefore, thus summarize the book. The inspired genius of our author takes the instance of this noble oriental Emir to furnish a great discussion of the validity of suffering virtue, and its position before the God of all the earth. He first draws aside the vail, and exhibits apocalyptically the secret of the divine Council over and above the world. The prince of evil is pictured as taking the infidel side, and questioning the reality of human virtue; and God as permitting the sufferings necessary to demonstrate the reality of a virtue acceptable to himself. Then we have, in the case of Job, the sum of human adversity. Children are slain, property destroyed, health reduced to leprosy; even the very last solace, the wife of his bosom, proposing apostasy from God, and the agonies of Job give forth in groaning rhythm the complete picture of suffering nobleness. Then come friends—*friends*, forsooth—with long and pious argument, making his misfortunes a proof of wickedness, and vindicating God at his expense. This completes the specimen case of human misery. Yet there comes meanwhile the discriminating *vindication.* First, self-assertingly, Job in repeated replies to each declares his own integrity, draws a picture of the days of his grandeur, and maintains the sublimity of his own virtue in prosperity. Next, apocalyptically, Elohim salutes him, and maintains that be-

fore God his virtues and nobleness are a very humble thing, and Job admits it with profound humility. Then comes the final vindication. Jehovah pronounces Job's accusers, whether Satan or men, to be culpably mistaken. For the former there is no atonement; but for the latter sacrifice and penitence are the source of hope. Redoubled prosperity for Job attests the reality of the divine approbation.

With this obvious construction of the argument of the book, we may express surprise at the perplexity of commentators as to the point in which God pronounces Job *right* and his friends wrong. Prof. Lewis rests that divine approval merely upon Job's last repentance and self-abhorrence before God. But it lies patent on the surface of the book that God pronounces Job *right* in the whole controversy, the whole one controversy between God and Satan, and between Job and his friends; a controversy, namely, whether there is a true virtue which can suffer, and can humanly err, and yet be accepted of God. Job was right in maintaining against the devil and his own three friends his own virtue; and when, at the admonition of God, he admitted that though his virtue could stand before men it could not stand before the Absolute, he was completely right. Abraham, says Paul, had whereof to glory, but not before God. (See our note on Rom. iv, 2.)

We may, after the above view, thus skeletonize the book:—

1. The picture of questioned (by Satan) suffering and agonized virtue. i–iii, 26.

2. That virtue questioned (by friends) and debated (iv–xxviii, 28) and sublimely pictured with grandest self-assertion by Job, (xxix–xxxi, 40,) closing the debate with the three.

3. After Elihu's attempt at compromise (xxxii–xxxvii, 24) God himself sublimely arraigns Job's virtues as nothing in comparison with Himself, and Job profoundly submits. Though he had gloried before men, he glories not before God. Whereupon God condemns the grounds of Satan, that there is no human virtue; the grounds of Job's friends, that affliction disproves such virtue in the individual; and, upon Job's admission that human virtue must submit before the Absolute, he pronounces Job right and his assailants culpably wrong. God and Job were true; Satan and the three were false. xxxv–xlii, 17.

It is eminently a Christian book; a book whose lesson is *faith*, whose pages foreshadow the *resurrection* and the *Redeemer*, and whose closing *pronunciamento* is *sacrificial atonement.*

History of the Cross. The Pagan Origin, and Idolatrous Adoption and Worship of the Image. By HENRY DANA WARD, M.A., U. S. A. London: James Nisbet & Co. Philadelphia: Claxson, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1871.

The very ingenious and scholarly article in our present number on *The Pre-Christian Cross* will attract attention; but while it may be presumptuous for us who have not made the subject a specialty to contradict one who has, we venture to doubt as to the legitimacy of its representations. We doubt whether the so-called "handled cross" is any cross at all; whether there is any thing standing in such relations as to be properly called a "pre-Christian cross," and whether the wonder and mystery are not to a large extent factitious.

As the *form* is the essential thing to being a cross, no figure is a cross that does not truly and exactly present the cross form. Now a cross is an intersection of two lines; and the lines must by crossing present four visible points or *termini*. Hence a T, *tau*, is not a cross, though a *t* is, or rather presents, a cross. Nor should the intersection be the result of carelessness formed into habit, and so be a cross only by degeneration. A perpendicular line surmounted by and terminating in a horizontal line is not a cross. We may even say that the churchly *crucifix* is not in idea an essential cross. Its purpose was to bear the human body, to which it is in shape conformed. Now the human body is no proper cross. It is simply a perpendicular trunk with two horizontally extensible arms appended; but the arms send no line across the trunk. There is, indeed, something striking in the wide extent of the tau and circle among the ancient nations, and Mr. Southall, in his great work, "The Recent Origin of Man," quotes it with some force in proof of the unity of the human race. But there the wonder ends.

Now the actual *cross*, and the actual *circle*, are at once the most simple and most striking of all primitive geometrical figures. Hence both are very likely to be largely appropriated for symbolical purposes among various races and ages. This fact warns us to beware of overlooking the independent origins of these appropriations. False identifications are very easy, and certainly have been repeatedly committed, as we may soon show. We have two crosses (+ ×) among our algebraic symbols; two (x and t) in our alphabet; and one (†) among our reference marks. It would be ridiculous to call either of these a pre- or post-Christian cross; but it strikes us as more ridiculous to call the tau and circle of Egypt and Assyria by such an epithet.

We accept the explanation of Zöckler, given on p. 315, that the

tau and circle represented rudely the sun and the sun's rays. And as the sun and sun-god are to the view of his worshipers the source of life, so the tau and circle symbolized life. Of the generative sun, *taurus*, or the bull, was the symbolic procreative animal; and the phallus, the image of the male organ of generation, was the simplest, yet obscenest symbol. The obscene phallus, publicly exhibited, shame to say, as an object of worship, was as universal as the tau and circle, both representing primitively generative life, and derivatively perpetual life.

Out of any relation whatever with the figures of the tau and circle is the *stauros*, translated *cross*, of the New Testament. The figures had no resemblance. The origins were entirely diverse. The *stauros* was the Roman implement of punishment. The Greek word *stauros* does not truly signify a cross, but a stake, and the horizontal bar forms no necessary part of it. It is derived from the verb *ἱστημι*, to stand, and in fact *stauros* and *stake* are two forms of the same word. Does any one suppose that the Roman *stauros*, the instrument of death, had any connection with the Assyrian tau and circle?

The little book of Henry Dana Ward, a devout American millenarian scholar, is written to show that the churchly crucifix is not only diverse from the New Testament cross, but is also diverse from the cross seen in vision by Constantine, (which was truly the Chi, X, the first letter of the name of Christ;) and that it is in fact borrowed from the Assyrian tau. We give the following quotation: "That which is now called the Christian cross was originally no Christian emblem at all, but was the mystic *Tau* of the Chaldeans and Egyptians. That mystic *Tau* was marked in baptism on the foreheads of those initiated in the mysteries, and was used in every variety of way as a most sacred symbol. To identify Tammuz with the sun, it was joined with the circle of the sun ☥. Sometimes it was inserted in the circle ⊕. The mystic *Tau*, as the symbol of the great divinity, was called the sign of life, and was used as an amulet over the heart. It was marked on the official garments of the priests of Rome; it was borne by the kings in their hand, as a token of their divinity or divinely-conferred authority. The vestal virgins of Rome wore it suspended from their necklaces, as the nuns do now. The Egyptians did the same, and many of the barbarous nations also with whom the Egyptians had intercourse, as the Egyptian monuments bear witness. There is hardly a pagan tribe where the cross has not been found."—P. 49.

But we see no good proof that the churchly cross was derived from the pagan *tau*. It was one of the actual forms of the *stauros* used in executing malefactors by the Romans, and hence was a proper form for the Church to adopt. Mr. Ward and his co-millenarians become slightly superstitious in opposing superstition, in their abhorrence of the crucifix and identifying it with the "mark of the beast."

Another false identification is that of the New Testament cross, or even the churchly crucifix, with the above-named Constantinian monogram, the so-called *cross* seen by the Imperator in vision which was subsequently prescribed on his standard and called the Labarum. Many of our best scholars have confounded these two things, for the monogram clearly includes an intersection. It is simply the Greek for the first three letters of the name of Christ. It was first used by the earliest Christians as an abridgment of the Saviour's name. It appears in the catacombs for the first time in A. D. 332, and afterward very abundantly. But it is to be specially noted that the churchly crucifix or cross does not appear in the catacombs until A. D. 407. On this subject consult the valuable work of Mr. Withrow, published at our Book Concern, on the Catacombs, pp. 265–273.

We have personally discovered here in North America a true "rain cross," as genuine as any in Mexico, mentioned p. 625. Within sight of our study window, upon a neighboring structure, is a perpendicular iron rod, surmounted by two horizontal crossing rods, indicating the four cardinal directions, with N. E. W. S. upon their points. This cross is surmounted by a gallant gilt steed, who at all times of the year and all the twenty-four hours may be seen heroically facing the wind whencesoever its blast. As we gaze upon his brave figure he seems becoming a thing of life, and we feel how natural was the fetichism of the primitive world. It is a true "rain cross," but has no connection with the Assyrian *crux ansata*, and none with the churchly crucifix.

One page from Mr. Ward will confirm our caution not to identify things that differ:—

"No. 1. the *stauros*, stake, or pale. Very rare and ancient.

"No. 2. Greek initial of Christ, answering to CH in English. Primitive.

"No. 3. the Constantinian monogram. A device of the first two Greek letters of Christ, corresponding to

CHR in English. This form alone is found on the coins, medals, and arms of Constantine and his successors. With

"No. 4. which are fashionable modifications of the monogram in the latter days of the empire.

"No. 5. equal armed, right-angled Greek cross, in various modifications, such as

common in the Eastern or Greek Church.

"No. 6. forked form. Rare. The idea of No. 6 is a forked trunk of a tree, to the arms of which the hands were nailed, and the feet to the trunk.

"No. 7. Common Romish Catholic cross.

"No. 8. Tammuz or Syrian form.

"No. 9. Jugum, the Latin yoke, or common gallows. See Minutius Felix.

"No. 10. Russian Church in Paris.

"Here are nineteen different forms recognized by great communions and learned authors under one common name in English —the cross—without any attempt to distinguish them from the *stauros*, or from the sorrows endured on it. Besides these, the books of heraldry supply twoscore more images of fancy crosses."

A Hundred Years of Methodism. By MATTHEW SIMPSON, D.D., LL.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 12mo., pp. 377. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1876.

This volume is not a history, but rather a historical survey of our progress and institutions as a Church. It is a lucid tracing of origins and developments. It discusses rather by narrative than by argument. It is written in a simple, transparent, flowing style, and the reader easily and rapidly flows with it. It is a manual for our people, and one of the best books in our catalogue for circulation among outside inquirers.

We have but two points of adverse criticism to make.

On page 151 the bishop says: "This report has been generally alluded to in the discussions which followed as 'The Plan of Separation.'" Now, if this misnomer, first forged by the reporter,

R. A. West, an English Methodist local preacher, and, with culpable carelessness, allowed by the editor to creep into the published minutes, is to be mentioned at all, its fictitious character ought to be mentioned with it. With an equally culpable carelessness our bishops, in the course of that discussion, "referred" to it by this forged title. And just this forged phrase, stereotyped and well circulated through the South, has had a very powerful effect to mislead Southern Methodism. Under its cover the Southern bishops put forth that disastrous dictum at St. Louis, "We separated from you in no sense in which you did not separate from us." The phrase does not indeed explicitly assert all that. It might be truly called a "Plan of Separation," in the sense of being a plan by which the South might separate on *their own responsibility*. But that is not its obvious import, and it has consequently served as a concise embodiment of a very great untruth.

On page 229, the bishop, discussing the sense in which the Episcopacy is called an "order," says: "The word 'order' is sometimes used in the sense of class or diversity of arrangement. We speak of the order of traveling preachers, and of the order of local preachers; we speak of the order of presiding elders, and the order of bishops."

If now the Episcopacy is no more an order than a presiding eldership, or a class leadership, the ordination of a bishop is unjustifiable, and should never have existed. If Wesley had intended his superintendent to be no more of an order than his class leaders, he would never have ordained him. And if the bishop's statement of the matter is accurate, we should strenuously urge that the ordination, by solemn laying on of hands, be forthwith constitutionally abolished. But the very fact of that ordination from Wesley, until now, contradicts and abolishes the bishop's statement.

The word "order" may be discussed as a verbal matter. The word order—Latin, *ordo*, and to *order*, or *ordain*, (for the verb to *order* was anciently used,) *ordinare*—has ever been used in the Church to designate an *ordained* grade of ministry and no other. If we have trustees, stewards, class leaders, sextons, presiding elders, Sunday-school teachers, choristers, surely it is futile to say that they are as truly orders as our ordained officers. It is an absurd classification that puts bishops with class leaders, and not with elders and deacons. Wesley ordained three grades of ministry; those three ordained grades of ministry he sent over here, and they were authoritatively accepted as being just what

he sent. He sent a form of "ordination" (*his* word was not "consecration") of three ordained grades, and at that time "ordination" was not only accepted, but, by the restrictive rule, was embodied into the constitution of the Church; so that it can be abolished or diminished only by a process of constitutional change. Somebody or other, we suspect it was not our General Conference, has indeed abolished Wesley's word "ordination," and substituted "consecration;" but those words in the English language mean precisely the same thing; or if there be a difference, the latter is the higher term. If, however, the change of the word is an essential change of the thing, whether to something higher or lower, then the change violated the constitution of the Church. And when, later, the General Conference resolved that the Episcopate was an office (like a class leader) and not an order, (like the two other ordained grades,) it committed two or three oversights in the same act. First, it contradicted, without repealing, that permanent and standing declaration with which our Book of Discipline commences, that "Wesley gave Coke letters of episcopal *orders*," and thus leaves us under a contradictory jurisdiction. Second, it classes our bishops with unordained and transient officials of the Church. Third, it contradicts the very title of our Church, for if the resolution be true, it would be more proper to call it the Methodist Class Leader Church than the Methodist Episcopal Church, the class leadership being our most distinctive peculiarity.

The word "order" is, however, of very little consequence. In regard to realities of things there is a general agreement. We all hold that the eldership is the truly fundamental order, the trunk of the ministry, that which must be in order to the bringing and keeping the Church in existence and operation. To this the deaconship is the apprenticeship nearly as indispensable; and by Church and ministry the Episcopacy is voluntarily created as vitally important, yet not absolutely indispensable; while the Church herself is the human fountain of the whole. Ordination of these three grades, by the solemn imposition of hands, is sanctioned, as all believe, by Scripture and the primitive Church; nor is any other form of instituting a ministry so sanctioned; nor is any other than these three sanctioned by any weighty example. We may also safely believe that the absence of ordination from a ministry is a disrespect to Scripture example, and a most serious formal defect. Equally safely may we say that no form of Church government is so sanctioned by Scripture and the Church precedent of all ages as the Episcopal. Any other form is defective, though not inval-

idating. Surely no one can be frightened at the use of the word order, if it be explicitly understood to mean simply "an ordained class."

Principles of New Testament Quotation Established and Applied to Biblical Science. By Rev. JAMES SCOTT, M.A., B.D. 12mo., pp. 169. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1875.

The quotations of the Old Testament have often been a source of puzzle both to the simple Christian and the learned scholar. The quotation varies from the words of the original author. Nay, the very meaning is different, and seems not to prove the point for which the text is adduced. Sometimes a great number of scraps of Old Testament words are huddled together and applied to something foreign from the original sense. Questions thereby of scripture honesty and of doctrinal theology become deeply involved.

Dr. Scott's little manual is a valuable guide in these matters. He classifies the various quotations, deduces the principles upon which they are made, illustrates them by a survey of the mode of quotation among the early Christian writers, and justifies them by classical and secular examples.

The Old Testament was not only the divine oracle, but the poetry and literature of the Jewish Church. Hence it was not only quoted to *prove*, but to illustrate and adorn the style. Nay, it was natural for a writer to run his thoughts into Scripture phrase borrowed from topics entirely foreign to the subject in hand. Between the Old Testament there is a close sympathy and a living oneness. The Old is preliminary and completed in the New. The doctrine and spirit of both are one.

It is by THREE GREAT WITNESSES that we attain unto religious verity, the WORD, the CHURCH, and the moral CONSCIOUSNESS, and these three are one.

The Word is the great current of spiritual thought running through the written text. Save the Decalogue alone the text is mainly human, and in what proportions the human and the divine are mingled is a problem not wholly soluble. We know the text as it stands is in many cases incorrect; we are often unable to be sure of perfect accuracy of the historic statements in non-essential particulars. We have inherited from ultra-Protestantism, Puritanism, perhaps too mechanical a biblical theory, as if every chapter and verse were written on stone by God's own finger. Admitting textual error only where it is demonstrated, it is never-

theless often much easier to the penetrative student rather to rest his mind upon the great currents of spiritual thought, (which is the soul of the text,) in which all the ages of the holy have sympathized and been spiritually identified. We are then secure from panic as if all were lost if there be passages whose perfect accuracy may be fairly questioned.

The Church is revealed to us in the history of Christian men, organizations, and doctrines. This gives us HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY. Woe to the man who "will not hear the Church." For, first, the Church is the great author, preserver, and interpreter of the Word. The volume of the book of the Word has lain in the ark of even the corruptest Church of Christendom. Based upon it, secondly, and found in it, is a great outline type of holy doctrine: the Trinity, the Atonement, the Sacraments, and the Retribution, from which no private interpretation must vary. In that great TYPE of doctrine, and even in one great type of ecclesiastical organization, Irenæus, Chrysostom, and John Wesley essentially agree. There is a great truth contained in the profound maxim, *What has every-where and always been believed by those who hold the supremacy of the Word is true.* This may not apply in exegesis. There may be texts which the great body of the Church have wrongly interpreted. There may have been tenets in regard to physical and cosmical things, and outside the limits of pure theology, in which every individual of the Church was mistaken. But within her limits the Church does not err.

The *Consciousness*, duly regulated by the Word and the Church in regard to spiritual truth, and exerting itself in honesty, is right. The two regulatives serve to secure from fanaticism and rationalism, while the due exercise of the spiritual Consciousness brings home the power of truth upon the soul. Thus under this great trinity of the Word, the Bible; the Church, the great sacramental body of believers in the Bible, and the earnest *Conscience* of the individual, the Christian man rests secure of truth and salvation.

The Speaker's Commentaries. Edited by F. C. COOK, Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Vol. VI, Ezekiel—Daniel—and the Minor Prophets. 8vo., pp. 750. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, & Co. 1876.

In this volume the notes on the Book of Daniel are wonderfully enriched from the late Assyrian discoveries. At every step illustrations crowd upon the commentator unknown to his predecessors. The claim that the book was written after the day of Anti-

ochus Epiphanes is demonstrably refuted, and its true origin in Babylon in the days of the captivity placed beyond candid question.

In his development of the force of Daniel's predictions, however, we think the commentator is weak and wavering. In the prophecy of the seventy weeks he gives at every step a list of opposing opinions and no definite line of thought of his own. He does not know whether the fourth kingdom is Roman or Syro-Egyptian. He thinks that identifying it with the latter does not invalidate its Messianic application. We think, fully knowing, that it is the now fashionable interpretation, that it draws out the spinal column of Messianic prophecy from the Old Testament. This is not, however, our main objection against it. We hold it to be unexegetical. Was it not the Roman kingdom that was smitten by Christ's coming, as the feet of the image was smitten by the stone? Then Rome was the fourth kingdom. And with this agrees the description of Belshazzar's vision of the fourth beast, which was stronger than either of its predecessors, as the Syro-Egyptian was not, though the Roman was.

Of course the commentator is not so old-fashioned as to notice the year-day theory of the prophetic chronology. Consequently he owns entire ignorance of the import of Daniel's two thousand three hundred days, and other numbers. And yet this very year-day reckoning he is compelled to recognize in the seventy weeks of this same Daniel. And in this very volume, under the express rule of "a year for a day," Ezekiel symbolizes the punishment of Israel and Judah of three hundred and ninety years by three hundred and ninety days. And plainly the principles of proportion requires that where a kingdom is represented by so reduced an object as a beast, or a series of kingdoms by the image of the human form, there should be a correspondent chronological reduction of at least a year to a day. As a beast is to a kingdom, so is a day to a year. We are as yet of the belief that the commentator that despises this key to prophecy will find Daniel and the Apocalypse crisp and wither in his hands.

To our own mind it greatly clears the difficulties of these two prophetic books to recognize the true symbolic import of the number *ten*. As *four* is the number of the creation as a frame, so *ten* is the representative number for the nations of the world, including the profane races. The Decalogue, with its *ten* laws, is the law for the world. The ten plagues of Egypt were a world-sign. The ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image are not to be found, as com-

mentators have sought, in precisely ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire divided, but in the universality of all the nations, more or less, of the world, succeeding the downfall of that empire, and even now existing in either hemisphere. These are symbolized by so small an image as the toes because unimportant to Daniel and his age, being minified as in perspective by distance of time. The same principle applies to the ten kings and to the ten horns both of Daniel and the Apocalypse. And the millennial thousand years being the cube of *ten*, is not an exact thousand, but a world-period of great indefinite length.

Methodism and the Centennial of American Independence; or, the Loyal and Liberal Services of the Methodist Episcopal Church during the First Century of the History of the United States: with a Brief History of the Various Branches of Methodism, and Full Statistical Tables. By Rev. E. M. Wood, Ph.D. 12mo., pp. 414. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1876.

Like the great majority of our thoughtful young men, Mr. Wood is religiously proud of the history and position of the Methodist Episcopal Church. With the great army of militant Methodism, his heart and soul are not with Strawbridge, O'Kelly, and M'Caine, the three erratic Irishmen, but with Asbury, Emory, and Wilbur Fisk. He does not invest in the job of taking down the timbers of our historical structure. Failures are a million where success like ours is but one. Demolition is easy, up-building is wearisome. Twelve Asiatic cities for decades of years, with millions of wealth, were required to build the proud Ephesian temple; it took but one incendiary with a single torch, in a single night, to lay it in ashes. Genius alone can construct, any fool can tear down; and among fools, the man who leads in tearing down our own Methodist Episcopal Church is entitled to wear the tallest foolscap.

The marked merit of Mr. Wood's book is that it leads through a variety of discussions, several of which are new. Another is that his discussions of trite topics themselves are seldom trite. He opens with a defense of Wesley's character against the charge of high toryism and hostility to American liberties. He traces the loyal history of American Methodism. He discusses and protests against public evils, including our position on the school question, and defends our view of the Christian and Protestant character of our nation.

In his Second Part he traces the history of our free, voluntary Episcopacy, its origin from Wesley; the failure of English Methodism to accept Wesley's Episcopacy and its unfortunate results.

Then come in series the questions of our own Episcopacy, the Presiding-Eldership, Lay-Delegation, the Union of Methodism, with a variety of other specialties. Mr. Wood has made a live, young, loyal, and jubilant book. We predict, and no man living will ever be able to refute our prediction, that an edition of it will be munificently printed and largely read by the joyous Episcopal Methodism of 1976.

The failure of English Methodism to accept Wesley's Episcopacy, of which Mr. Wood gives a full and interesting history, may be excused, but the attempt on the part of some English Methodists to interfere with ours cannot be excused. On this subject the course of the English delegates to our last General Conference was scantily courteous. The truth of Mr. Pope's statement that Methodism is universally Presbyterian, we promptly deny. Mr. Wesley avowedly disliked Presbyterianism, preferred an Episcopal form of government, and in accordance with his plan we are negatively not the Methodist Presbyterian Church, but positively the Methodist Episcopal Church. We became so by our own free choice, and by our own free choice we shall so remain.

What the best English Methodists "think of us," so far as that is important, we may find in the following words of Dr. Dixon, who, of all the delegates from England that ever visited our Church, is most worthy of our honor: "If we mistake not, it is to the American Methodist Episcopal Church that we must look for the real mind and sentiments of this great man." We may also quote the following words of the London (Wesleyan) Quarterly: "It may be questioned whether any form of Church government in the world has more of the elements of power and permanence than this, which expresses Wesley's own idea of a fully organized Church."

The Legends of the Old Testament traced to their Primitive Sources. By THOMAS LUMSDEN STRANGE, late a Judge of the High Court of Madras. 8vo., pp. 243. London: Trubner & Co. 1874.

Judge Strange finds the originals of the Old Testament narratives in the old Aryan literature by giving to the Aryan a stupendous antiquity, and to the Hebrew an extreme recency. Old Jacob Bryant had a century or two ago found coincidence between the classic mythology and Hebrew history; but holding the Hebrew to be by far the more ancient, he maintained that the mythology was the borrower. Mr. Strange reverses this process, and main-

tains that the Hebrew is the plagiarist. And did he *prove* this immense antiquity of the Aryan he would in some instances make out a case. His proofs are, first, the archaic character of the Aryan literature, and, second, the records of Indian Astronomy. Professor Whitney's dictum, quoted in the last Quarterly, denying that languages furnish any chronological measure, reveals the slender value of linguistic proofs of antiquity; and his treatise on Indian Astronomy, in a former volume of his, disposes of the argument from that source. Charles L. Brace, in his valuable work, "The Races of the Old World," though a favorer of the immense antiquity of man, tells us that "the Indian history, so long boasted of for its immense antiquity, is, without doubt, the most modern of the ancient records, and offers nothing certain beyond 1800 B. C."

On the other hand, the early chapters of Genesis are the guide-book of George Smith and the Assyriologists in decyphering the earliest remains of the earliest empires. Mr. Strange believes that Ezra made the Old Testament after the Babylonian captivity. But the writer of the Pentateuch was, as Ezra was not, intimately acquainted with Egypt, and the Mosaic ritual was largely appropriated from that of Egypt. Its Babylonian origin, after the first eleven chapters of Genesis, is out of the question. Those eleven chapters did undoubtedly come from Babylonia with Abram himself.

The question of the antiquity of the Aryan race is very important to Dr. M'Causland's theory of the plurality of human origins. His doctrine is, that the Adamic-Messianic race, being the Caucasian, is the latest created, belonging to the Edenic center of creation. This Adamic or Caucasian race includes, as he thinks, the Japhetic or Aryan, the Shemitic, and the Hamitic. The other races, as the Chinese, the Lapps and Finns, the negro, and the fossil man, are either *antediluvian*, having been unreached by the flood, or *pre-Adamic*. If pre-Adamic, the race is still one in mental and physical nature, one in blood, that is, in prolificacy, and one in the headship of Christ.

The Lord's Land: A Narrative of Travels in Sinai, Arabia Petræa, and Palestine, from the Red Sea to the entering in of Hamath. By HENRY B. RIDGAWAY, D.D. 8vo., pp. 745. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1876.

In the year 1874 Dr. James Strong, our chief rabbi at Drew, led a small caravan of Christian scholars through the Arabian desert to the Holy Land, and through the Holy Land, inclusive of Moab,

to Beyrout. The route, selected with scholarly skill, took in nearly every point of biblical interest, and so its narrative claims to be more complete than any other itinerary record. Starting from Cairo, it crosses the northern point of the Red Sea, and furnishes discussion and clear conclusion of the true Mosaic crossing. Entering the desert plainly marked by Moses's own statement, they pass by the assumed and the real Sinai. They pass by Petræa to Hebron, and from Hebron to Jerusalem. Jerusalem, the City of the Great King, is their objective point, the center of interest, where they linger and survey the sacred localities. An excursion eastward discloses to them the Land of Moab. Thence from Jerusalem through Samaria, passing Gerizim and Ebal, they career to Jezreel, Tabor, and Nazareth. Dr. Ridgaway narrates and describes in a pure, clear, scholarly, and attractive style. His volume is furnished with most excellent maps, and very graphic pictorials. We travel with him both by faith and by sight. Whoso wishes to survey by proxy the "sacred acres" he can never see with eye corporeal, will hereby perform the exploit with eyes mayhap better than his own. And the delight of his expedition will be grandly enhanced by the rare style with which Nelson & Phillips have done up the work. Seldom does any publishing house in America or Europe issue so beautiful a book.

Sermons. By E. M. Marvin, D.D., LL.D., one of the Bishops of M. E. Church, South. Edited by T. O. Summers, D.D. Pp. 552. Nashville, Tenn. Publishing House of M. E. Church, South. 12mo. 1876.

Most of Bishop Marvin's sermons here published were delivered from the pulpit, yet are presented with such modifications as transfer from pulpit to press would suggest. A large share of them presuppose, what the ordinary congregation is not, an audience of thinkers. A line of elevated thought is maintained. The style is animated, and often bold, without being sensational or prevalently pictorial. The expositions are fresh and clear, and the applications of truth to actual life are pertinent and forcible. The doctrines are evangelical, as might be expected from the high position of the preacher. We wish it had been in the easy power of Dr. Redford to do better justice to the bishop's productions by a richer external style.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Mind and Body. The Theories of their Relation. By ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D., Professor of Logic in the University of Aberdeen. 12mo., pp. 196. . 1875.

Professor Bain may be considered as the almost official psychologist of the dominant materialistic-atheistic school of thinkers in England and America. Their fundamental doctrine is by them often called *monism*, or unisubstanceism; that is, the denial of that *dualism* which implies the essential distinction between mind and matter, God and the creation. Believing in one substance solely, they nevertheless profess not to decide whether that substance should be called matter or spirit, and so dislike to be called materialist or atheists. Nevertheless, as the monistic substance they admit as solely existing is what we really know as matter, they seem really to be materialists. So far as the mind is concerned, it is, they hold, a series of *states of consciousness* through which organized matter passes, and the series must therefore terminate with the break-up of the organization. The soul is but a phase of bodily organism. Mr. Bain is explicit in declaring that soul has no separate existence; and the fact of the non-existence of such a separation recognizable by science is his ground for holding the monistic view. The closing statement of his volume is: "The arguments for the two substances have, we believe, now lost their validity; they are no longer compatible with ascertained science and clear thinking. The one substance with two sets of properties, two sides, the physical and the mental—a double-faced unity—would appear to comply with all the exigencies of the case."

This magisterial dictum, however, is preceded by nothing in the volume, so far as our hunt through its pages has discovered, which sustains it. The book is a very weak performance. Modern science, which it so pretentiously quotes, has not at all advanced the real argument for materialism. The main change attained by science is such an anatomization as to show the stupendous number of fibers and cells contained in the nervous system and brain. There are enough to furnish a route and a locality for every mental movement and idea of our lives. This furnishes ground for clearly viewing the physical system as a most complete and complex *mechanism* or instrument for the soul. But this view Prof. Bain rejects, inasmuch as "it assumes that we are entitled to speak of mind apart from body. Of mind apart from body we have no direct *experience*." But this statement is nothing more than the old stronghold of materialism. There is nothing new

about it. Every form of the argument for that doctrine that has ever existed is reducible to this one: we have *no experience of mind separate from organization.* Personally we should deny the truth of that statement. Personally we believe the spirit of man, surviving the death of the body, has often made itself visible to living men. Rejecting all those so-called spiritualistic phenomena produced by human manipulation or other means, we say that there are too many well-authenticated narratives, furnished by unimpeachable authority, of the actual existence and disclosure of spirit separate from the body to allow of reasonable denial. With Henry More and Wesley, we meet materialism with this argument just at this point and deny its proof from *experience.*

Our materialistic, or, as they prefer to be called, "monistic," brethren are very anxious to prove that all *mind-power* is identical with *matter-force.* Their maxim is, as propounded by Buchner and adopted by Bain, "there is no force without matter and no matter without force," which is a very *forcible*, though, as we view it, false antithesis. But the non-identity and absolute contrariety between mind-power and matter-force, or, as we will call it, psychological power and physical force, we attempt to demonstrate in the following manner:—

General Grant is in command of one hundred thousand men. This one hundred thousand men, with an individual weight, each man, of one hundred and fifty pounds, possesses a weight of fifteen million pounds avoirdupois. And as their weight is equal to a solid block of granite of that same specific gravity, we will, by way of clearness, call them a block of solid granite. Now the problem is how to move this solid block of granite weighing fifteen million pounds by an antecedent which is not a physical force. It is a case of Grant *versus* granite, and the process is as follows:—

General Grant is sitting in his big tent with a map before him, looking very demure. He slowly comes in his cogitations to a mental *conclusion;* he forms next a distinct mental *conception* that the block must move, and he ends with a *volition* that it shall move; which presuppose three *psychological* processes. He then orders his aid-de-camp to deliver his commands to his generals. In a few hours the granite block of fifteen millions avoirdupois is moved to a position five miles distant. Now by what commensurate physical force was the block moved? The only antecedent was General Grant's volition (passing through the intelligence and wills of a few of his officers) to effectuate the movement. Leaving out the intermediates, General Grant's mere voli-

tion moved a block of granite weighing millions. Here, then, was a stupendous *psychological* causation producing an immense material movement. Had the block been moved by a physical machine, what a vast apparatus would have been necessary! *Solid matter, then, to an extent without assignable limit, may be necessitated to obey a purely psychological causation.* There is a mind-force which is not a matter-force and yet controls matter.

In General Grant's brain there was, indeed, a slight molecular movement, implying an infinitesimal amount of physical force. In his act of speaking, also, there was exerted by the volition a small amount of corporeal force. Upon the tympany of the ear of his aid there was a slight physical impulse produced by the articulate sound which was the vehicle of the *idea*. None of these minute forces, however, are, as physical forces, of any account in the moving the block. These slight forces passing from tongue to tympanum are merely the *carriers* of the non-material *idea*. And that non-material IDEA it is, followed by the series of equally non-material volitions, conducted by these carrriers, which moves this block of fifteen millions.

Physical force, we are told, may be *stored*, as in fact it is, in the coal mine. But no force of fifteen million pounds was stored in the white matter of General Grant's brain. In his brain there is only that modicum of force sufficient for the molecular action co-ordinate with the thought-action. The precise antecedent, therefore, of the movement of this fifteen million avoirdupois is a psychological causality, namely, a mental volition. The stupendous physical movement was the precise result of a purely psychological causality, in total absence of any physical force. It is a psychological power producing an enormous physical effect. Does not this plain fact demonstrate forever the absolute difference between *mind-power* and *physical force*, and the ordinary subordination of the latter to the former?

Let us now look into the mind of each individual soldier as he starts in this movement. First, his tympanum is affected by an articulate vocality which is the vehicle of a thought mentally received. That *thought* is then formed by him into a distinct mental *conception* of what he is to do, and that *conception* is succeeded by a mental *volition*. Thus far the causation process is purely mental, with only enough of the physical conditions to furnish vehicles for the successions of mental causation. But now comes a physical phenomenon. A mass of matter weighing one hundred and fifty pounds, namely, one human body, is moved in

immediate consequence of that volition, in strict obedience to it, and in absolute and pure causation by it. And thus a train of purely psychological causations, passing from General Grant's mind, through the minds of the officers, to the minds of the soldiers, produces a physical phenomena as great as a small earth quake. From this we deduce these corollaries:—

1. That mind-power is in essence entirely another thing from physical force; and so mind is probably an entirely different essence from matter.

2. That matter receives from mind-power a compulsion to obedient motion, and is by it moved and shaped. A material substance is controlled by a spiritual agent.

3. This fully agrees with the maxim in Zoology, that it is life or mind which constitutes and shapes organization, and not organization life or mind.

4. The conception of this primordial origination and supremacy of mind-power over physical force and substance has no definite limits. The universal amount of physical organization is doubtless produced by an anterior amount of mind-power. The whole world-system is mind-created.

5. When we say Ego, and our mind falls inward and back upon our *self*, we are right in identifying that *Ego* as something back of and superior to the bodily frame, to the brain, or to the nerves. There is the spirit distinct from the body; organizing and using the body as its machine.

6. The spirit ruling the body, yet conditioned by it, rightly feels its own analogy with the supreme Spirit which rules the body of the Cosmos.

7. It is out of reason to suppose that between us and the supreme Spirit there are no intermediate intelligences. Science may know nothing of them, yet truth and reason may. How improbable that our five little senses can take in all there is! Were we endowed with a new sense as comprehensive as our sight, what a world of new existences would it uncover, not contradicting any now known truth, but opening a vast addition in conformity with it. Hence common sense rejects the narrowness of materialism.

The Development of Creation on the Earth. By THOMAS LUMSDEN STRANGE, late Judge of the High Court of Madras. 8vo., pp. [illegible]. London: Fulner & Co. 1874.

Mr. Strange writes from the stand-point of ethical or pious deism, of which he appears to be a somewhat voluminous cham-

pion. He has written a work entitled "The Bible; Is it the Word of God?" also, "The Speaker's Commentary Reviewed;" and "The Legends of the Old Testament," noticed below. In the present work, assuming the existence of God, the immortality of the human soul, the validity of prayer, and the eternity of matter, he furnishes an outline of the process through which the system of things has evolved from primordial crudeness to its present state of comparative order. Assuming the theoretical nebular stage, as well as the existence of a central fire, he, of course, accepts an "earth's crust." He finds this crust first covered with water; and marine life, vegetable and animal, first coming into existence. Rejecting Darwinism with decisive hostility, he claims that the key to living forms of existence is "spontaneous generation." Thus far Judge Strange appears, in spite of himself, to agree with Moses; for, so far as we hold the first chapter of Genesis to be a literal history of the stages of creation, "spontaneous generation," *based upon the divine purpose and power*, seems to be the Mosaic statement in express words. The words of God (Gen. i, 9, 20) are, "Let the earth bring forth grass," "Let the waters bring forth abundantly." This language seems most naturally interpreted to mean that living beings sprang by divine power from water and from land. All that was visible in these processes was "spontaneous generation;" and the divine fiat underlying the process Judge Strange would not deny. He quotes the atheist Büchner as saying, "Spontaneous generation played, no doubt, a more important part in the primeval epoch than at present; nor can it be denied that in this way beings of a higher organization were produced than now." Why not, indeed? If a mite can be produced by spontaneous generation, why not a mammoth or a man? To suppose the difference of magnitudes in such a matter should make any difference in the possibilities is absurd. The difference of magnitudes is great only as measured by the grasp of our eye-sight; and the productive power of nature certainly cannot be regulated by a due proportion to our optics. A mammoth is no bigger than a mite to the Absolute. We have, indeed, little "doubt," that phenomenally, at any rate, Moses, and the atheist Büchner, and the deist Strange, are all three harmonious and correct. We believe, with our present light, that *infusoriæ*, and fishes, and mammoths were produced in full size by a divinely determined "spontaneous generation." The geologic page we all know presents the mammoth, for instance, *at once full grown;* and Darwinism must hunt a good while for the many needed

links connecting it, by the very long needed chain, with any predecessors of inferior magnitude and lower species.

From the doctrine of spontaneous generation Mr. Strange argues the falsehood of the statement of Moses, that God rested from creation on the seventh day. New beings, he claims, are being perpetually brought into minute existence. His argument, however, rests on the assumption that spontaneous generation takes place, as a purely natural process, subsequent to the close of the creative week, and even at the present day. That assumption we do not admit, and science denies.

Mr. Strange believes indeed in the immense antiquity of man, quoting the stock proofs of that hypothesis with faithfulness; nor do we know that such hypothesis would at all contradict Genesis. If man were created as he essentially maintains, instead of being developed from a lower animal form, there may have been different centers of creation, and Genesis may be the narrative of a special center. And this would establish a plurality of origins, but a oneness of human nature and general destiny. Such a conclusion might affect our exegesis of a few texts, but would destroy no article of our theology. But the evidences for the pre-Adamic man seem growing small by degrees and beautifully less.

We quote the following sharp thrust at Darwinism :—

> Dr. Strauss is one among the many in the ranks of the learned who have accepted Mr. Darwin's theory. He thus endeavors to illustrate the development of form through the operation of the instincts and habits of the animal itself. "Let us suppose," he says, "a herd of cattle of primeval time to be still destitute of horns, only possessed of powerful necks and protruding foreheads. The herd is attacked by beasts of prey; it defends itself by running against them, and butting with the head. This butting will be the more vigorous, the bull the fitter to resist the beasts of prey, the harder the forehead with which he butts. Should this hardening in any individual have developed to an incipient horny accretion, then such an individual would have the chance of preserving his existence. If the less well-equipped bulls of such a herd were torn to pieces, then the individual thus equipped would propagate the species." (*The Old Faith and the New*, 217, 218.) It will be observed how determined the process of begging resorted to in view to establish the required results. But are they established? We may have the thickening of the frontal bone, and the production on it of excrescences. But why are these latter, in their ultimate development, ever confined to a pair correspondently arranged, tapering to points as if constructed under an artist's eye? We might look not for two, but twenty such developments, forming a regular *cheval de frise*. Why do we never even see the fabled unicorn? How is it that elephants, the most violent butters in the world, have their horns (so to call them) growing out of their mouths, and not from their foreheads? Can the beautiful convoluted ornaments on the head of the antelope, or the complicated branching antlers of the stag or reindeer, many pointed, with each point on the one horn matched by a similar one on the other, be possibly due to the art of butting? The butting would splinter off the branches, but assuredly not favor their symmetrical growth.—Pp. 34, 35.

Man and Apes: an Exposition of Structural Resemblances and Differences bearing upon Questions of Affinity and Origin. By St. George Mivart, F.R.S., Lecturer on Zoology and Comparative Anatomy at St. Mary's Hospital. Small 12mo., pp. 200. 1874.

If we are really and truly descended from the apes this is an important book; for every man must be interested in making the acquaintance of his ancestors. All true Darwinians, therefore, should rejoice in the fact that its pages abound in pictorial exhibitions of their ancestry; for inasmuch as the proof that they are the legitimate progeny depends on likeness, they must be profoundly interested in tracing their own lineaments in these miniatures. So profuse, indeed, are the pictorials, that the book might well be entitled The Darwinian's Mirror. From the profound enthusiasm which many Darwinians exhibit in favor of their ape descent, and the fervor and rapture they display in propagating their theory, we are almost converted to the concession that *they* specially are tail-less monkeys, not only in descent, but in heart and soul. When *we* come really to believe in the original plurality of races, we shall easily assign these exultant devotees of brutalism to the ancestry they so fondly covet. Otherwise it seems to us that, even if proof compelled them to the belief of Darwinism, they would confess it with a slow and sad reluctance. Nothing but a downward proclivity can, as it seems to us, inspire this devout joy in proving a brutal pedigree.

Mr. Mivart's purpose, however, seems to be the reverse. His purpose is to show that there are great difficulties in deducing man from monkeys. No one species of monkey specially so approximates to man as to make any easy transition. The points of resemblance are scattered through a variety of species, and some of the most striking analogies are found in apes of low and remote grade. The gorilla in particular is more a brute than some of the smallest apes.

We may remark that Mr. Huxley thinks he has established a great deal when he can say that the anatomical distance between the lowest monkey and the highest monkey is as great as the distance between the highest monkey and man. But does that mean any thing? It only proves that there may be a long trail of descending ape species; and if the chasm between man and monkey is as broad as that long monkey trail is long, it may be a very enormous chasm. One or two invariable traits running through an immense series of animal grades may tie them into a species or genus. And if man is distant from monkey through the whole length of that series, then the missing links

between man and monkey may be immense in number. And so they are. Geology must hunt a good while to find them.

And now we will tell these, our inquiring apes, what is the proof we require. Mr. Darwin went to the "pigeon fanciers," and succeeded in developing breeds of pigeons so widely diverse from each other that had they been seen by a stranger to the process the different varieties would have been taken for different species. And this piece of fancy play is palmed upon us, as some proof of the development doctrine. But, 1. The pigeon is known to be a creature of flexible variability; as the goose, for instance, is not. 2. The pigeons developed by Mr. Darwin would all revert back to the original form if left to themselves. 3. The different varieties were prolific among themselves. But we will now propound a crucial test of the ape descent of man. Let Mr. Darwin or Professor Huxley take a menagerie of apes, and by scientific process work up a man, a Frankenstein, or a manufactured Huxley. Let the whole cohort of Darwinists supply themselves each with a whole cohort of monkeys, and develop them into true, live Darwinists and Huxleyans, and they may succeed so largely as in due time to become a majority by manufacture. We will then give it up; not only because we are out-voted, but because we are convinced.

This is a simple test, and so easy in itself that it ought not to be declined. If it be true, as Mr. Huxley tells us, that man is as near to monkey as monkey is to monkey, then man ought to be deducible from monkey. We hear it boasted that some most accomplished breeders can furnish you in sufficient time almost any model of animal you please to delineate. Very well, we present a challenge. We chalk out a perfect outline of Prof. Huxley's figure, and say: "Friend Seebright, we want more Huxleys. Here is your model; take a *quantum sufficit* of apes, and turn us out a first-class lot of *savants* to order." Be it done, and we surrender.

Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1875. Edited by SPENCER F. BAIRD, with the assistance of Eminent Men of Science. 12mo., pp. 628. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Dr. Baird's valuable annual brings us, promptly and faithfully, his summary of the results of the advances made by our scientific brethren in the various parts of the world. We cannot too much admire the divine curiosity and earnest enthusiasm with which they prosecute their journey toward omniscience; which assuredly is a long as well as "a hard road to travel." The triumphs of science go far to excuse the arrogance in which some of its leading

masters indulge. Pure love of truth and glowing ambition for its discovery are royal attributes of the *savant;* leaving it profoundly unnecessary for him to create a sensation by any utterances that menace the foundations of morality or religion.

The present volume begins with a copious analytical index of sixteen pages, rendering reference to any item easy. Then follows a general summary by the Editor of near two hundred pages of scientific progress. The remainder of the volume is devoted to brief paragraphs reporting the various items of research.

Under the head of Prehistoric Researches we find that some highly imaginative *savants* have been drawing up magnificent "prehistoric charts" of France, Germany, etc. The following will do for a specimen:—

At the Geographical Exposition, Paris, a prehistoric chart of France was exhibited by M. Mortillet. The same author has completed a scheme of French early history.
The *Palæolithic Age* he divides into four epochs:—
St. Acheul. (Almond-shaped flaked ax.) The oldest.
Moustier. (Flint arrow-heads and scrapers, bilateral flake.)
Solutré. (Bay-leaf shaped arrow-head, bilateral chipping.)
Madelaine. (Barbed bone arrow-heads and flint knives.)
The *Neolithic Age* has one epoch:—
Robenhausen. (Polished stone axes, flint arrow-heads, serrate chipping.)
The *Bronze Age* has two epochs:—
Morgien. (First appearance of bronze.)
Larnaudien. (Objects hammered out, greater variety and finish.)
The *Iron Age, Protohistoric Era*, has two periods—the *Tumulus* and the *Gallic.*
The *Tumulus Period* has one epoch:—
Hallstattien. (First appearance of iron.)
The *Gallic Period* is called
Marnien: epoch of the Marne, Helvetian epoch, third Lacustrian epoch. (Appearance of money.)
The *Iron Age. Historic Era*, has two periods—the *Roman* and the *Merovingian.*
The *Roman Period* has two epochs:—
Lugdunien. (Roman money and industry prevailing.)
Champdolien. (Decadence of art and industry.)
The *Merovingian Period.*—Pp. clviii, clix.

Great difficulty is experienced in tracing the pedigree of man back to his original animalcule. The difficulty is to bridge it across from the vetrebrate to the lower orders. Darwin finds the bridge to be the *lancelet* or *Amphioxus*, which has a notochord or long ligature, serving as a sort of backbone. Agassiz objected that the notochord ran along the belly, and so was no backbone at all. The following presents the present "situation" of the discussion:—

In a work on the origin of the vertebrates, Dr. Dohrn indulges in some speculations as to the ancestry of these animals. His embryological investigations lead him to seek for the probable ancestors of the vertebrates among the Arthropods (crustacea and insects) rather than the Tunicates or Ascidians, and to revert to the views of the elder St. Hilaire, who described insects as vertebrates which

walk with their backs downward, rather than to those of Kowalevsky and others, who trace the line through the Ascidians and the lancelet. So far from being the representative of the original vertebrates, the *Amphioxus* is regarded by Dr. Dohrn as a degenerate descendant of the cyclostomous fishes, and the so-called larvæ of the Ascidians are the result of a still longer-continued process of degradation.

On account of these and other speculations, renewed attention is being paid to a study of the embryology and anatomy of *Amphioxus*, the lancelet. Mr. Balfour considers that it is not necessary to conclude that *Amphioxus* itself was the ancestor of the vertebrates, but merely that the earliest stages of development of this supposed vertebrate ancestor were similar to those of *Amphioxus*. The egg of *Amphioxus* differs from that of other vertebrate animals in having less food-material or yolk, and Balfour thinks that this accounts for the differences in the early stages of the embryo. Still he thinks that all the modes of development found in the higher vertebrates are to be looked upon as modifications of that of *Amphioxus*. One common feature which appears prominently in reviewing the embryology of vertebrates as a whole is the derivation of the middle germ-layer (mesoblast) from the third or inner layer, (hypoblast,) though it should be stated that so high an authority as Kölliker thinks that the middle layer is derived from the outer one. Among the invertebrates, however, the middle germ-layer is derived from the inner germ-layer.

Professor Huxley publishes meanwhile a note upon the "brain and skull" of *Amphioxus*. By reason of the supposed absence of renal organs, and of any proper skull and brain, Agassiz was led to separate the lancelet from all other fishes; and Haeckel, going farther, made a distinct division of the Vertebrata (*Arcania*) for its reception; while Semper, in a lately published paper, separates it entirely from the vertebrates. Huxley now describes what he believes to be the representative of the ducts of the Wolffian bodies, or "primordial kidneys" of the higher vertebrates, in *Amphioxus*, and he also endeavors to point out that, although *Amphioxus* has no completely differentiated brain or skull, "yet it possesses very well-marked and relatively large divisions of the cerebro-spinal nervous axis and of the spinal column, which answer to the encephalon (brain) and the cranium of the higher Vertebrata." Professor Ray Lankester also contributes an important paper on the anatomy and embryology of *Amphioxus* as compared with the higher fishes.—Pp. cxcviii–cc.

Professor Cope gives the following sketch of the geological origins of certain mammals:—

The elephant is a Pliocene form, and the true rhinoceros Upper Miocene. In the northern hemisphere the dogs are Miocene. In North America the opossum, and probably the raccoon, are Eocene; the wolves and foxes appeared in the Miocene age, and the weasels in the Pliocene. Perhaps the cats first appeared in the American Pliocene. Comparatively few mammalian types mark, by their origin, the latest geologic epochs. Such are the ruminants, as deer and oxen, with the true horses, which all commence in the Upper Pliocene of the northern hemisphere. Finally, man alone signalizes the last or glacial period, and is to reach his culmination in the ages that intervene between that great time-boundary and one to come. Thus a certain proportion only of the life of a given epoch is characteristic of it—that is, originates in it; the remaining members being legacies from preceding ages. Hence the latest forms of life embraced in an extinct fauna are the true indicators of the chronological relations of that fauna.—Pp. ccviii.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Missionary Life among the Villages in India. By Rev. T. J. Scott, D.D., Twelve Years Missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church in India. 12mo., pp. 343. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1876.

Minds interested in the subject of missions often feel a wish to realize the nature of actual missionary life. We wish to *see*, as with our own eyes, what are the daily and weekly details which the preacher of Christianity passes through in his routine of work. It is just this wish that Dr. Scott endeavors to fulfill in these pages. There are few expansive pictures or comprehensive general views. It was from his pen some years since that we published in our Quarterly the first description perhaps ever furnished in America of the Brahmo Somaj, the new sect of Hindus, who, having fully discovered the futility of their traditional religion, are trying to found a religion upon intuitional theism and natural ethics. But his present purpose is to narrate the daily and nightly adventures, moral and physical, through which the missionary passes, so that we may know how it seems to be a Methodist preacher in Hindostan.

The variety of characters and events encountered furnishes a study. Now he meets a candidate for conversion who will become a Christian for a few village lots, or one who will turn Christian when certain others do. Now turns up a vociferator, who, by mere continuity of brawl, will occupy the time and prevent the missionary being heard. Now comes a smart logician, who will prove that as God has made hell, folks ought to be wicked and go to hell, lest the object of the creation of hell be defeated. Then a learned Mohammedan, well read up in the books, ready to prove to the missionary that Christians have corrupted the New Testament by expunging all those texts that predicted the coming of the Arabian prophet. Then comes a Buddhist, who, with dreamy eye and hollow voice, maintains that all things are *maya*, illusion; there is no reality; the object of life is to dissipate the fatal phantasmagoria and attain *nirvana*. A Panthiest then, an Asiatic Ralph Waldo Emerson, mounts the stage, to whom all things are God, including especially himself. And every-where, through all this East, reigns the doctrine of fate, *kismat*, paralyzing every moral energy and every practical enterprise, reducing the masses to inertness and stolidity. For all these, Christianity, with its practical morals, its strong exhibit of individual responsibility, its emphasis upon the Divine Personality, its doctrine of sin and salvation through a divine

Redeemer, its alternatives of eternal bliss or woe, seems to be the true remedy. In offering with unceasing steadiness this remedy from place to place, Dr. Scott's adventures strikingly resemble those of Jesus and Paul. He meets now with noisy opposition, now with soulless indifference, now with captious gainsaying and insult; but anon with calm attention, or listening interest, or solemn inquiry. There are those who would be Christians for a temporal advantage; those who would be so but for the great opposition they would suffer; and those who will be so when the rest of the people are. And, finally, there are the elect few, who realize their sin, and seek for Christ as their great deliverer. These are the seed of the Church and the hope for lost India.

Dr. Scott's narrations and occasional reflections enable us to see very clearly that the conversion of the three hundred millions of India to at least a nominal Christianity is but a question of labor and time. Among the causes of such a result are the following: *First.* The English Government is a just and benevolent despotism, bringing anarchy to order, with a constant spontaneous moral pressure favorable to Christianity as the supreme power. *Second.* The establishment of schools and universities will destroy the Hindu system of religion, and leave the minds and hearts of the people vacant, an "aching void" which no people can long endure. *Third.* The presses of the Bible and Missionary Societies are scattering, through colporteurs, Bibles, religious books, and light tracts, with a plentiful hand, and with a diffusive and powerful effect. By these the missionary finds himself every-where auspiciously anticipated; and the people are being gradually impregnated with Christian impressions. Mr. Scott suggestively says: "It is probable that a conviction of the truth and infinite superiority of Christianity will gradually permeate the mass long before the people in large numbers turn openly to Christ. Then the movement will begin—family will follow family, village will follow village, in a rapid spread of true and nominal Christianity. Now we must work away, scattering broadcast the seed, till for India also glorious 'times of refreshing come from the presence of the Lord.'"—P. 232. But, *Fourth.* The living missionary, the ardent, tireless evangelist, the flaming Methodist itinerant, is absolutely necessary to exhibit the example of spiritual life, to prevent the Christianity from being merely nominal, to rouse the people to a true Christian zeal, and to fight with the sword of the Spirit the earnest battle of genuine conversion and true holy living. In this work nothing is so important as the rapid raising up of a noble

body of native evangelists of the right sort; men of deep Christian experience and rich baptism of the blessed Spirit. How earnestly and constantly should the prayers of our home Church ascend to God for the bountiful outpouring of the gift of holiness and power on the native members of our young conferences in Hindostan! And never may we forget our own beloved missionaries, whose hearts would faint amid their weary work but for the consciousness that in their own America the sympathies and prayers of multiplied thousands are ever alive in their behalf.

Dr. Scott's volume is a valuable addition to our missionary library.

Queen Mary: A Drama. By ALFRED TENNYSON. Author's edition, from advance sheets. 16mo., pp. 263. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., (late Ticknor & Fields, and Fields, Osgood & Co.) 1875.

"Queen Mary," a tragedy by Tennyson—how different from Tennyson! Where is that tender streak of his earliest poems, that most delicate and delicious hide-and-seek of love and fancy? Where the deep, but not profound, debates of "Locksley Hall," "The Two Voices," and "In Memoriam?" Where the tripping narrative of "Enoch Arden?" Hardly a vestige of it here. As Longfellow's "New England Tragedies," so Tennyson's; each has the sweet and musical author left out. There is stir here. Ever at arms. There is conflict of politicians and priests. Every thing but life and Tennyson. Once or twice a Tennysonian expression gets in, but it seems as out of place as the "wee, timid, cowering beastie" of a mouse under Burns' scythe. Green's story of Mary, in his "History of the English People," is more dramatic than Tennyson's. The drama is valuable as a political pamphlet, but it will never make or unmake a Romanist or a Protestant. Shakspeare's dramas are a necessity of Shakspeare, as Scott's historic and local poems and novels were of Scott. Had Shakspeare essayed the epic he had failed. A grand outburst against Romanism, or a subtle, dreamy, story-telling poem, showing its absurdity and crime, would have dropped into the heart of all England and America. It is as true of poets as of shoemakers, that they must stick to their last.

Here are lines that Tennyson might have written when at his best:—

> "God change the pebble which his kingly foot
> Impresses into some more costly stone
> Than ever blinded eye."

Cleopatra's barge is copied here:—

"We had your royal barge, and that same chair,
Or rather throne, of purple on the deck.
One silver cross sparkled before the prow,
The ripples trembled at their diamond-dance.
The boats that followed were as glowing gay
As regal gardens: and your flocks of swans
As fair and white as angels, and your shores
Were in mine eyes the green of Paradise."

Not much of Shakspeare or Tennyson here. Far better this:—

"How many names in the long sweep of time
That so foreshortens greatness, may but hang
On the chance mention of some fool that once
Brake bread with us, perhaps: and my poor chronicle
Is but of glass."

Best yet this:—

"I have seen
A pine in Italy that cast its shadow
Athwart a cataract: firm stood the pine—
The cataract shook the shadow."

The poem is full of force, if not of fancy, and will do good service in the great battle between mailed superstition and Christian truth. As such, its spirited characterization may be more valuable than mere imaginative musings. H.

The Masque of Pandora, and other Poems. By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. 16mo., pp. 146. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., (late Ticknor & Fields, and Fields, Osgood, & Co.) 1876.

Longfellow's last is one of his best, the "Masque of Pandora." Especially are the minor poems attached to this leading drama of the highest finish of this poet's art. Belisarius, and the three sonnets to Felton, Agassiz, and Sumner, are admirable. The eye does not yet lose its brightness, nor the brain its music. Why will he not turn his gifts to turning Homer into English hexameter? He is its only master. He can give us the immortal English from the immortal Greek. His Masque shows his leanings. Let it also lead to higher things. His own line necessitates work; let it be in these high directions:—

"Much must he toil who serves the immortal gods."

H.

Periodicals.

The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease. Edited by J. S. JEWELL, M.D., Professor of Nervous and Mental Diseases in Chicago Medical College, and H. M. BANNISTER, M.D. Associate Editors, W. A. HAMMOND, M.D., New York: S. WEIR MITCHELL, Philadelphia; E. H. CLARKE, M.D., Boston. July, 1876. Whole Series, vol. iii. 8vo., pp. 538. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons.

This periodical, put forth by our able and energetic contributor, Dr. J. S. Jewell, is an honor to the University whence it comes; but however attractive the mysterious territory between mind and matter which forms its subject, the periodical is too entirely professional to interest generally the non-professional reader.

In the present number, however, a special interest is awakened by a lively skirmish between the chief editor and Dr. Hammond, the New York assistant editor. Dr. Hammond, who has lately published a work on nervous diseases, is a most pronounced materialist, and, like a certain class of physicists, assumes, by virtue of his scientific acquirements, to be master of theology and psychology, and all other branches of human cognition. Though denying the Omniscient, they virtually profess omniscience. Dr. Hammond in his book, maintains that mind is force generated by the brain. We suppose it would follow that as there is no infinite material brain, so there is no infinite mind. And doubtless Dr. Hammond would admit that with the dissolution of the brain there is a consequent dissolution of the mind. Dr. Jewell does not press him with these consequences, but subjects the crude statement that mind is force to a severe analysis, which is all that was necessary.

One of the flashes of Dr. Hammond's omniscience appears in a book-notice by him of Brinton's "Religious Sentiments" in terms following: "That prayer is [has?] ever a direct response of [from?] the Deity, either negatively or affirmatively, Dr. Brinton does not believe—and we presume not many enlightened theologians will venture to disagree with him. The benefits of prayer are entirely subjective." Indeed! Then He who said, "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find," was not an enlightened theologian. We will then quote an author for whom Dr. Hammond may entertain a higher respect, David Hume, who on this subject very truly said, "We can make use of no expression, or even thought, in prayers and entreaties which does not imply that those prayers have an influence." So that even Dr. Hammond may, perhaps, see that his doctrine reduces all prayer to a farce and a folly, which, indeed, he probably thinks it is. But, then, as to "theologians," he must

understand that all Protestant theology holds that forgiveness of sin, justification, sanctification, and eternal life, are gifts bestowed in direct "response" to prayer. What an omniscient in theology he must be who does not know this!

Foreign Theological Publications.

Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. (The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Atonement.) Von ALBRECHT RITSCHL. Bonn: A. Marcus.

Professor Ritschl, of Gottingen, one of the first thinkers of Germany, has given us here the fruit of a life-time of study. It is regarded as the weightiest issue from the German press for some time past. The work embraces three stout volumes. The first and second are historical and critical; the third presents the author's own views. Notwithstanding the twofold title, the work is chiefly a treatise on the doctrine of the atonement. The historical volumes will have the most worth for general readers, for they present a critical statement of the series of views on the atonement which have prevailed in the Orthodox Church, such as can nowhere else be found with such exhaustive and satisfactory thoroughness. The chapters of the first volume, after an Introduction, run thus: The Atonement, as held by Anselm and Abelard, by Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, by the later Middle Ages, by the Reformers; the Reformatory view as against that of the Romanists and of Osiander; the Orthodox Lutherans and Calvinists in conflict with the Socinians; the dissolution of the Anselmic view by modern thought; the Atonement among the Kantians; revival of the Abelardic tendency by Schliermacher and his disciples; the Pietistic and neo-Lutheran view; the recent speculative views. This will show the wide and rich field over which the author takes his readers.

As to what the author's personal position is, we shall here only state that it is not rationalistic in our American sense of that word. On the contrary, it aims to be thoroughly loyal to the Bible. But the author claims the right to derive his views directly from Scripture rather than through the tortuous channel of dogmatic tradition. One of the results is that Dr. Ritschl is inclined to moderate St. Paul's too commercial and rabbinical view of justification by the views of Peter and James. These two apostles, being eye-and-ear

witnesses, were better prepared to give an uncolored reflection of Christ's views than Paul, who was not. As far as critics have yet discussed the book, they abound in praise of its erudition and scientific value. Some shrug ominously their shoulders, but they hesitate as yet directly to attack it. It is a ponderous shot from so heavy a gun that they feel safer in waiting until the first reverberations have died away.

Martin Luther: Sein Leben und Seine Schriften. (Luther's Life and Writings,) Von Dr. JULIUS KOSTLIN, Professor in Halle. Elberfeld: R. L. Friedrichs.

Three hundred and twenty-eight years is a long time to wait for one's biography. But Luther has done it. True, he has had scores of so-called biographies, small and great, but none of them were standard; none gave general satisfaction. They were either dull chronicles of facts, or gross laudations, or violent assaults. The proper depiction of the great man as a man, as a Christian, as a reformer, and as a Church father, had not taken place, and could not well take place before our own day. Luther's own Church could not well have given him a satisfactory biography. That Church, like too many others, has been divided within itself, and each section has never claimed to be more truly Lutheran than any other. Hence it needed precisely the present day of mitigated dogmatism, of unionistic aspirations, of earnest Christian liberalism, to give to Luther the worthy biographer. Dr. Köstlin is this. His great work of eight books, in two stout volumes, is a masterpiece of research and of elegant composition. It will, doubtless, furnish also the basis for fresh Lives of the reformer in other languages.

Die Spekulative Theologie, (Speculative Theology.) Von IMMANUEL HERMANN FICHTE. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

This work of (the younger) Fichte, though published several years ago, is yet of such sterling worth as to be worthy of fresh notice. Fichte's aim is, in opposition to Hegel's abstract idealism, to establish upon a firm basis a true system of ideal-realism. He rejects all *à priori* knowledge, and admits only such conceptions as spring from clear intuitions. Starting out from the world of reality with its monadic personalities, (man, etc.,) he reasons his way back to the first monad, the absolute person, (God.) Taking the world as a *fact*, he argues, as absolutely necessary to any explanation of its actual structure and peculiarities, to one primitive, *designing*

Will. His speculative theology is, therefore, a carried-out argument as to the existence and character of God, whereof the concrete world, with its orderly complexity, furnishes the premises. He lays particular stress upon the teleological argument, giving to it a new significance. The world is not merely a totality of relations; it is also an ascending series of purposes or ends. Each single thing is both an end for itself, and a means for another—the result of a lower series, and the basis of a higher. And here appears the curious fact that the realized end, though a product of its antecedents, is yet that on account of which the antecedents alone existed. Thus, that which does not yet exist is efficient by anticipation: the end is both the cause and the consequent; and the means is also both consequent and cause. The ends are anticipatorily active in their means; hence the means do not themselves effect the end. But anticipatory action of the ends in the means is not real, for the ends are not yet real. Hence a third factor is implied, to direct the means toward its end, to point the end before it exists. This third factor is the absolute, or God—the one who fixes the end, and evolves it out of its means. This idea of an intelligent and volitional Absolute, working in the means to an end, is the sole possible explanation of the vast *quantum* of uncon scious teleological action which is every-where manifest in the world. Having attained to this idea of God, as the thinking and volitionating Absolute, Fichte proceeds to evolve from it its inner riches, as constituting the *absolute personality*. God has in his being an ideal and a real phase—*spirit* and *nature*. Fichte lays great stress upon the nature-phase of God, and shows that, with the common, abstract, natureless God of deism and of too many theologians, the conception of creation out of pure will is impossible. Even pantheism is better than such a deism, it being absolutely impossible to think the attributes of omnipotence and omnipresence, of world-preservation and world-government, without admitting a realistic immanence of God in the world. Here the conception of the trinity is explained as the absolute interpenetration, in God, of spirit and nature, of subject and object, of the knower and the known. In regard to creation, Fichte regards the ordinary notion of creation out of nothing as unbiblical, unnecessary, and absurd. Creation is conceivable only as a going forth, into duality, of the nature-phase of God's own being. God is himself, so to speak, the material of creation. Thus the universe is not outside of God, but in God. God is not the world, but the world is in God. The world is not a machine once finished and

set in motion, and then left to run itself, but its inner vitality is the potentiality of the primitive, divine nature which constitutes its essence. Miracles are not transcendent incursions into nature by a metaphysical, transmundane God, but they are, properly understood, simply such divine action upon the world as is identical with ordinary divine providence. Fully comprehended, they no more interrupt the course of nature than does the divine action which causes the lily to blossom. This holds true even of those master-miracles, revelation, incarnation, inspiration, regeneration. There is no iota of the arbitrary, or unorderly, or extraordinary, either in God's nature or in the goings-forth of this nature in creation and history. We only need to have our eyes opened in order to see that in all things there is harmony, unity, consistency.

So runs the general course of Fichte's philosophical theology. Such systems, though not filling the place of biblical theology, have yet their great uses. They help dogmatic theology gradually to slough off the deformities with which a mistaking exegesis and a venturesome metaphysics have burdened it.

Der Kampf des Christenthums mit dem Heidenthum. (The Contest of Christianity with Heathenism: Pictures from the Past as Mirrors for the Present.) Von G. Uhlhorn, Dr. Theol. Ober-Consistorialrath in Hanover. Stuttgart: Meyer und Ziller.

A very excellent, liberal, orthodox, historical review of the process whereby true religion took root in humanity, overturned Græco-Roman heathenism, and seated itself in the thrones of the civilized Occident. It is also a book with a "tendency," that is, with a calculated practical bearing; it aims to show how religion should treat the State, and what the State has to do with religion. To do this it shows the inner nature of Christianity, describes the *manner* of its revolutionary action on the old state of things, and explains its sudden paralysis so soon as seated in the imperial throne. It consists of three books and ten chapters, 376 pages in all.

Book First: The Two Powers in Conflict. Chap. I. The Religious Condition of the Heathen World. Chap. II. The Moral Condition of the Heathen World. Chap. III. The Christians.

Book Second: The Contest. Chap. I. The First Engagement. Chap. II. The Christians brought to Judgment. Chap. III. The Inner Change in both Parties. Chap. IV. The General Persecutions.

Book Third: The Victory. Chap. I. The Definitive Struggle. Chap. II. The Triumph. Chap. III. The Last Reaction of Heathenism.

It is rare that we find pleasanter or more useful reading than these ten unitary, but yet organically connected essays. Aside from its rich review of historical and religious truth, the lesson of the book is this: the absolute dangerousness of the least intermingling of Church and State. Leave to Cesar the outer secular world of form and force; leave to the Church the inner world of theology and conscience.

Die Genesis, nach Knobel neu bearbeitet von Dr. August Dillmann, Professor in Berlin. (Knobel's Genesis thoroughly reconstructed by Prof. Dillmann.) Leipzig: Hirzel. 1875.

Dr. Dillmann's Commentary on Genesis, though based on the work of Knobel, is one of the most thorough, original, erudite, and critical works to be found in theological literature. In form it is rather distinctive and rationalistic, but in spirit it is respectful and reverent. It holds fast to the hypothesis that Genesis is a digest from three primitive, but widely-differing, documents. But, irrespective of its hypercritical hypothesis, the work furnishes in detail a store-house of critical, archæological, and topographical lore which the scholar will thankfully acknowledge.

Miscellaneous.

First Century of the Republic. A Review of American Progress. By Rev. T. D. Woolsey, D.D., LL.D., Rev. F. H. P. Barnard, LL.D., Hon. David A. Wells, Hon. Francis A. Walker, Prof. T. Sterry Hunt, Prof. William G. Sumner, Edward Atchinson, Prof. Theodore Gill, Edwin P. Whipple, Prof. W. H. Brewer, Eugene Lawrence, Rev. John F. Hurst, D.D., Benjamin Vaughn Abbott, Austin A. Hunt, M.D., S. S. Conant, Edward H. Knight, and Charles A. Brace. 8vo., pp. 506. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Lectures on the Gospel. By J. H. Seiss, D.D. 8vo., pp. 1160. Lutheran Book-store, Smith, English & Co. 1876.

Daniel Deronda. By George Eliot. Two Volumes, 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Daniel Deronda. By Charles Elliott, author of "Adam Bede," etc. Complete in one volume. Paper cover. 8vo., pp. 274. New York: Harper & Bros.

The Two Destinies. A Novel. By Wilkie Collins. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 312. New York: Harper & Bros. 1876.

Pastor's Comprehensive Directory. For the Pocket. Arranged by Rev. ALEXANDER M'LEAN, of the New York Conference. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1876.

This Directory may be recommended as a very ingenious "pocket" convenience for Pastors.

Jehovah-Jesus: The Oneness of God; The True Trinity. By ROBERT D. WEEKS. 12mo., pp. 140. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1876.

Infidelity Answered by the Father God and his Family. By Rev. JOHN B. ROBINSON, A.M., President New Hampshire Conference Seminary and Female College. 12mo., pp. 268. Boston: For sale by James P. Magee. 1875.

The Vines of Eshcol. By Rev. J. B. ROBINSON, A.M., Dayton, Ohio. 16mo., pp. 133. United Brethren Publishing House. 1876.

Shakspeare's Tragedy of King Richard the Second. Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M., formerly Head Master of the High School, Cambridge, Mass. With Engraving. 12mo., pp. 225. New York: Harper & Bros. 1876.

The Mikado's Empire. Book I, History of Japan from 660 B. C. to 1872 A. D. Book II, Personal Experiences, Observations, and Studies in Japan, 1870 to 1874. By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, A.M. 8vo., pp. 625. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

The Select Works of Tertullian. Edited for Schools and Colleges, by F. A. MARCH, LL.D. With an Introduction, by LYMAN COLMAN, D.D. 12mo., pp. 241. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Harper's School Geography. With Maps and Illustrations, prepared expressly for this work by eminent American Artists. Large quarto, pp. 124. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Liver Complaint, Nervous Dyspepsia, and Headache: Their Causes, Prevention, and Cure. By M. L. HOLBROOK, M.D. 12mo., pp. 140. New York: Wood & Holbrook. 1876.

Historical Studies. By EUGENE LAURENCE. 8vo., pp. 508. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1876.

Elements of Latin Grammar in Connection with a Systematic and Progressive Latin Reader. By GUSTAVUS FISCHER, LL.D. 12mo., pp. 236. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co. 1876.

English Grammar. By S. W. WHITNEY. 12mo., pp. 282. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co. 1875.

The Mask of Comus. By JOHN MILTON. 12mo., pp. 282. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co. 1876.

Notices postponed to next number:

Riehm on Messianic Prophecy. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

Stanley's Jewish Church. Third Series. Scribner, Armstrong, & Co.

Haeckel's History of Creation.

Mivart's Lessons from Nature.

INDEX.

Abbott, American Pioneers and Patriots. Page 387
Abbott: Benjamin Franklin 580
Africa 5
  Livingstone's Belief in Regeneration of... 7
  Baker's (Sir S. W.) Expedition to Central 11
  Influence of Music on Africans 16
  Climate of 23
An Extraordinary Character—Mrs. Somerville 416
  Birth and Early Days of 416
  First Marriage and Subsequent Studies... 420
  Second Marriage 421
  Intellectual History of 422
  Perfect Symmetry of her Womanly Character 425
Anglo-Saxon Race, The, Its History, Character, and Destiny 87
  History: Four Periods 90
  Civil Polity of the Saxons 102
  Characters of the Language 105
  Mental and Physical Characteristics of the 110
Ascher: Die Erziehung der Jugend (Pedagogics) 193
Atwater: History and Significance of the Sacred Tabernacle of the Hebrews 181
Aubertin: Sénèque et Saint Paul 197

Bain: Mind and Body 744
Baird: Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1875 751
Baker: Carter Quarterman 388
Baker's Ismailia 5
Bancroft on "The Native Races of the Pacific Races of North America" 532
Bangs: History of the Methodist Episcopal Church 628
Baptist Quarterly 149, 347, 529, 699
Barnes's Notes on James, Peter, John, and Jude 579
Beecher: A Summer Parish 194
Berean Question Book 195
Bertram Family, The 195
Bibliotheca Sacra, and Theological Eclectic 149, 347, 529, 699
Bixby: Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge 558
Bledsoe on Notice of Dr. Myers' Book, by Editor of this Quarterly 700
"Boniface Question" 718
Braddon: Hostages to Fortune 196
Bread and Oranges 387
British and Foreign Evangelical Review 150, 355, 530, 705
British Quarterly Review 150, 357, 534, 705
Browning: Aristophanes' Apology 573
Buckley: An Address on Supposed Miracles 371
Buckley: Christians and the Theater 182
Burr: In the Vineyard 386
Burr: Thy Voyage; or, A Song of the Seas, and other Poems 190
Burr: Toward the Strait Gate 194
Butler: The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature, etc 185

Carleton: Farm Legends 196
Cary: Select Dialogues of Plato 196
Caspari: A Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ 372
Castelar: Life of Lord Byron and other Sketches 387

Christian Quarterly ..... Page 149, 347, 530, 699
Church Property, Taxation of 243
Church Record, The 579
Clarke: His Natural Life 387
Cocker: The Theistic Conception of the World 185, 511
Codex of the Second Epistle of Clement 720
Collins: The Two Destinies 763
Congregational Quarterly 149, 347, 530, 699
Conquest of Europe, The 195
Conversion of the Germans to Christ, etc ... 717
Cornwall: Free, yet Forging their Own Chains 580
Cosmic Philosophy, The 655
  A Puzzle 655
  What is it to Know 657
  Theory of Relativity 660
  Scientific Theory 663
  Doctrine of Evolution 664
  Instability of the Homogeneous 665
  Instability of the Heterogeneous 666
  Is the Doctrine Atheistical? 669
  Intelligence Needed 670
  Personality of First Cause 673
Cowles: The Gospel and Epistles of John .. 580
Cox, G. W.: The Crusaders 580
Cox, S. S.: Why we Laugh 387
Crafts: Open Letters to Primary Teachers. 580
Crane: Methodism and Its Methods 192
Creeds of the World, The 154
  Area and Population of the five large Divisions of the World 156
  Leading Creeds 156
  The Three Large Divisions of Christendom 158
  Independent States under Christian Governments 581
Creighton: The Age of Elizabeth 579
Crooks: Life and Letters of Rev. John M'Clintock, D.D., LL.D 575
Culmann: Die Christliche Ethik 192
Currie: History of the Wesley M. E. Church of Brooklyn, L.I 579

Daily Christian Advocate 545
Daniel Deronda 763
Darwin's Book on "Insectivorous Plants". 851
Davies: The Gift of the Holy Ghost 194
Dickens: Christmas Stories 387
Dillmann: Die Genesis, nach Knobel neu bearbeitet 763
Disosway: What God Does is Well Done .. 194
Disruption of Methodism, The 292
  Ecclesiastical Changes of Position 293
  Circumstances of the General Conference of 1844 296
  Action of Louisville Convention, 1845 301
  Action of General Conference of 1848 306
Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1844-46, The 170, 292
  Original Aggressions of the Slave Power.. 171
  Dealing with Bishop Andrew in 1844 173
  The (Falsely) So-called Plan of Separation 174
  Rescission of the Plan an Insulting Proposal 175
  Points of Law Touching our Episcopacy.. 177
Doane: Infant Baptism Briefly Considered.. 372
Doubleday: Reminiscences of Forts Sumter and Moultrie in 1860, 1861 387
Draper: History of the Intellectual Development of Europe 579
Dunn: Satan Chained 885

Early Phases of Civilization.....Page 715
Edinburgh Review.....150, 530, 705
Elfreda 196
Eliot: The Exemption from Taxation of Church Property, and the Property of Educational, Literary, and Charitable Institutions 243
Emory: History of the Discipline of the M. E. Church..... 628
Encyclopædia, Biblical..... 386
Ephraim to Golgotha, From 152
Ethnic Religions, the Propædeutic Office of. 30
Excavations in the Cave Kesslerloch in Switzerland 531

Fabre: (Trans. by L. W. Bacon) The Abbe Tigranes, Candidate for the Papal Chair 196
Fancher: Laws Relating to Religious Corporations 579
Fargeon: An Island Pearl 196
Farrar: Families of Speech..... 564
Farrar: The Life of Christ..... 183
Fichte: Die Spekulative Theologie..... 760
First Century of the Republic..... 763
Fischer: Elements of Latin Grammar in Connection with a Systematic and Progressive Latin Reader..... 764
Fiske: Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy..... 655
Fleharty: Social Impurity the Sin of the World in all Ages 195
Fleury: Saint Paul et Sénèque 197
Foreign Literary Intelligence..159, 364, 542, 724
Arnobii adversus Nationes, libri vii..... 161
Commentary of Book of Job 162
Commentary to the Gospel of St. John... 161
Commentary to "the Sacred Writings of the New Testament"..... 161
"Doctrinal System of the Church of Rome," The..... 160
Fragments of Papias..... 161
France 543, 726
Germany.....542, 724
Hand-Book of Biblical History..... 161
Journal for Church History..... 364
"Philo, of Alexandria, as Interpreter of the Old Testament"..... 160
"Reply to the Remarks on the Holy Ghost Contained in the Old Catholic Declaration" 162
Roman Catholic Papers 364
"Spontaneous Decomposition of Christianity and the Religion of the Future." 159
Theologische Literatur-Zeitung..... 364
Foreign Religious Intelligence, 154, 362, 539, 722
Creeds of the World, The 154
Germany..... 539
Old Catholics, The..... .....362, 722
Fuller: Appeal to the Records in Vindication of the Policy and Proceedings of the M. E. Church in Relation to the South. 381

Galatians of Asia Minor, The Nationality of. 359
Gardner: Mehetabel..... 196
Gautama and Lao-tzŭ.... 644
Buddha..... 646
Chinese Reformers 648
Doctrines of Buddhism, etc..... 651
Teachings of Lao-tzŭ..... 652
The Lao-te Ching..... 654
General Conference of the M. E. Church, 1876. 545
General Conference of 1844..... 133
Defense of its Action in the Case of Bishop Andrew..... 133
Bishops Dependent on the General Conference 147
Gill: Analytical Processes, etc..... 386
Gladstone: Homeric Synchronism..... 578
God in the World..... 511
Object and Character of Dr. Cocker's Work 515
Time and Space—What are They? 518

God in the World.....Page 511
Present Relation of the Creator to the Creation 523
Moral Government of the World 527
Governmental Legalization of Prostitution. 705
Great Social War, The 705
Green: Stray Studies from England and Italy 580
Griffis: The Mikado's Empire..... 764
Guthrie, Thomas, Autobiography of..... 386

Hale: The Fall of the Stuarts and Western Europe from 1678 to 1697 580
Hall: Familiar Talks to Boys..... 580
Harnack: Contributions to the History of the Marcionitic Churches 536
Harper's School Geography..... 580, 764
Hay: Victor and Vanquished 387
Hilgenfeld: Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie..... 197
History of Protestant Missions in India. The 678
Holbrook: Liver Complaint, Nervous Dyspepsia, and Headache, etc 764
Holt: God's Way, etc..... 194
Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version, The, Edited by Canon Cook, 580, 727
Hovey: Religion and the State..... 243
Hymn Book of the Methodist Episcopal Church, The 309
Object of a Church Hymn Book..... 310
Great Variety of Hymns necessary 312
Question of Size..... 315
Should the Methodist Hymn Book now be Revised? 318
Plan of Revision 321

Indian Mission, Our..... 79
Inman's Work on "Ancient Faiths and Modern"..... 581
Inorganic Methodism 162
Call to the Ministry..... 163
Ordination by Laying on of Hands..... 165
Wesley's Ordaining Act Accepted. 169
"Is Davis a Traitor?" etc..... 701
Is "Eternal" Punishment Endless?..... 579
Is the Modern Sunday-School Method a Success?..... 272
Twofold Object of the Sunday-school..... 272
The International Series 274, 287
General Want of Familiarity with the Bible 276
Defects in Present Method of Instruction. 279
Bible Should be Learned..... 283

Jenkins: The Devil's Chair 387
Johnson: The Catskill Fairies..... 191
Joint Commission on Fraternity 703
Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, The 758
Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church 628

King Pul..... ... 150
Kostlin: Martin Luther: Sein Leben und Seine Schriften..... 760
Kukluxism 702

Lange: Exodus 580
Lanier: Florida, Its Scenery, Climate, and History 569
Larsen: Lena..... 580
Laurence: Historical Studies..... 764
Leiss: Lectures on the Gospel 763
Leofwine, the Saxon..... 196
Lesson Compend, The..... 195
Lester: The Pre-Adamite; or, Who Tempted Eve? 195
Lewin: Life and Epistles of Saint Paul.... 197
Lewis: The Vedder Lectures..... 194
Lightfoot: St. Clement of Rome..... 869
Little Foxes..... 195
Livingstone's Last Journals..... 5

London Quarterly Review. Page 150, 351, 531, 705
London Quarterly Review (N. Y.)..150, 531, 705
Longfellow: The Masque of Pandora, and other Poems 757
Lucretius 64
Outline of Philosophy of 66
Theory essentially one of Development.. 69
Compared with Modern Philosophers 70
Theory of Mind and Soul 74
Literary Merit of 78
Luthardt: St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel. (Revised by C. R. Gregory).. 365
Lytton: Pansanias the Spartan 387

Macbeth: The Might and the Mirth of Literature 196
Macduff: The Gates of Praise, etc 386
Macduff: The Mind and Words of Jesus; Faithful Promiser; and Morning and Night-watches 386
Macpherson: Life and Labors of Duncan Matheson, Scottish Evangelist 387
March: Athenagoras 576
March: The Select Works of Tertullian 764
Marian's Mission: or, The Influence of Sunday-schools 195
Marvin: Sermons 748
Matthews: Words: their Use and Abuse .. 580
M'Clintock and Strong: Cyclopædia of Biblical and Ecclesiastical Literature 553
M'Clintock's Life, Notice of 704
M'Lean: Pastor's Comprehensive Directory. 764
M'Leod, Dr. Norman, Memoir of 575
Merrill: Christian Baptism; its Subjects and Mode 579
Methodism, The Disruption of 292
Meyer: Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book of the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians 372
Millennium and Second Advent, The 433
Scripture Testimony concerning Christ's Kingdom 438
Rev. Richard Watson on the Royalty of Christ 441
Dr. Whedon on the "Gospel of the Kingdom" 448
"Parousia"—Exegesis of the Word 452
Miller, Hugh: The Footprints of the Creator 386
Miller, Hugh: The Testimony of the Rocks. 386
Miller, John: Fetish in Theology, etc 387
Milton: The Mask of Comus 764
Mivart: Man and Apes 750
Modern Sunday-school Method, Is it a Success? 272
Monsants and Languellier: A Practical Course with the Spanish Language 195
Morgan: The Gift of the Holy Ghost, etc.. 386
Murphy: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms 371
Myers: Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1844-46, The 170, 292, 700

Naville: The Educational Question 538
New Brunswick Review 197
New Englander 347, 530, 699
New England Historical and Genealogical Register 149, 348, 530, 699
Newman: The Thrones and Palaces of Babylon and Nineveh from Sea to Sea: A Thousand Miles on Horseback 384
North American Review 348, 530, 699
Nurses for the Needy 387

Obadiah 389
Date of Prophecy 389
Person of 393
Analysis of Prophecy 394
General View of the Prophecy of 411
Oliphant: The Curate in Charge 387
Organic Methodism ..... Page 111
Wesley's Societies Real Churches 114
American Methodism 117
Contention between Asbury and Strawbridge 119
"Imposition of Hands" 127
Origin of Man, Recent 581
Orton: Comparative Zoology, Structural and Systematic 562
Our India Mission 79
Its History, Field, Work, Men, Difficulties, and Statistics 79-86
Our Sunday-School Literature 324
Books must be Readable 325
Love Stories should be avoided 329
How can Sunday-School Literature be made Acceptable and Useful? 331
Present State of our Sunday-School Publications 325
Owen Gwynne's Great Work 388

Papillion: Nature and Life 374
Parsons: The Believer's Victory over Satan's Devices 580
Passage of the Red Sea, The 223
Local Claims Examined—
1. At the "Bitter Lakes" 227
2. At Suez 230
3. At Ras Atakah 235
4. At Ras Tarafineh 241
Patrum Apostolicorum Opera 367
Payn: Halves 387
Peck: The Central Idea of Christianity 553
Peculiarities of the Pastoral Epistles, Of the 458
Doctrinal Contents 459
Doctrine of the Constitution of the Christian Church 467
Heresies Referred to 477
Linguistic Peculiarities 483
Peter in Rome, Question Regarding 535
Pollard: Gipsy's Adventures 195
Porter: A Comprehensive History of Methodism 386
Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review 149, 348
Presiding Elders, Should they be Elected? .. 257
Price: Currency and Banking 387
Prime: Forty Years in the Turkish Empire; or, Memoirs of Rev. Wm. Goodell 387
Proofs of the Existence of God, The 151
Propædeutic Office of the Ethnic Religions, The, and their Comparative Value in the Divine Education of Humanity 30
Definition of Terms, "Law," "Justification" 31
Religion Defined 41
Analysis of Religious Consciousness 46
Müllers' Classification of Religions Criticised 50
Historical and Genetic Connection of the Religions of the World 63
Protestant Missions in India, History of... 678
Missions Begun 679
Arrival of Schwartz 682
First Convert 684
Opposition of the Indian Government 684
Serampore Missions—College Established 686
Dr. Duff and Mission Colleges 689
Work in Arcot by the Scudder Family ... 695

Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church 150, 348, 530, 699
Rapids of Niagara, The 387
Rau: Early Man in Europe 553
Recent Origin of Man 581
Megalithic Monuments and Tumuli 583
The Lake Dwellings 586
The Kjokken Möddings, or Shell Heaps .. 590
The Bone Caves 592
Solutre 600

Recent Origin of Man.....Page 551
The Gravel and Peat of the Valley of the Somme in France..... 601
The Fluvial Period..... 610
Red Sea, The Passage of the..... 223
Relations of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the Cause of Temperance..... 628
General Rules..... 629
Report prepared by Dr. Fisk..... 633
Dr. Bascom's Report..... 634
Debate of 1844..... 636
Action of General Conference of 1848..... 637
Advance in 1860..... 638
Reports in 1864 and 1868..... 639
Relation to National Temperance Society. 642
Religion in America..... 345
Revue Chrétienne.....153, 361, 538, 721
Rhodes: The French at Home..... 580
Ribot: Heredity; A Psychological Study of its Phenomena, Laws, Causes, and Consequences..... 373
Richmond: Hope Raymond..... 195
Richmond: The Two Paths..... 195
Ridgaway: The Lord's Land..... 742
Ritschl: Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versohnung (The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Atonement)..... 759
Robinson: Infidelity Answered by the Father God and his Family..... 764
Robinson: The Vines of Eshcol..... 764
Roe: From Jest to Earnest..... 196
Rolfe: Select Poems of Oliver Goldsmith, with Notes..... 196
Rolfe: Shakspeare's Tragedy of King Richard the Second..... 764

Schopenhauer and his Pessimism..... 487
Personal History..... 489
Outline of Philosophy of..... 493
Essential Defects of the System..... 509
Schutzenberger: On Fermentation..... 580
Schweinfurth's Heart of Africa..... 5
Scott, James: Principles of New Testament Quotation Established and Applied to Biblical Science..... 737
Scott, T. J.: Missionary Life among the Villages in India..... 754
Select Poems of Thomas Gray..... 580
Seneca, Lucius Annæus, the Last of the Stoic Philosophers..... 197
His Relation to Ecclesiastical History.... 197
Personal History of..... 199
Estimate of his Life and Character..... 208
His Philosophy..... 210
Works of..... 214
Editions..... 216
Relations of St. Paul and..... 216
Servetus's Works..... 719
Sherring: The History of Protestant Missions in India, etc..... 673
Should Presiding Elders be Elected?..... 257
Election of the Presiding Elders Contrary to the Constitution of the Church..... 258
Proposed Change a Fundamental One.... 261
Proposed Change would be Injurious..... 266
Simpson: A Hundred Years of Methodism. 734
Simpson, Bishop, Picture of..... 194
Slaughter: The Modern Genesis..... 568
Smith: Chaldean Account of Genesis, etc.. 378
Southall on "The Antiquity of Man"..... 534
Southall: The Recent Origin of Man, etc., 581, 715
Southern Papers on Kukluxism..... 702
Southern Review.....150, 700
Speaker's Commentaries, The, Edited by Canon Cook..... 733
Spiritualism on Trial..... 589
Spurgeon: Commenting and Commentaries. 552
Stevens: History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America..... 628
Story of the Apostles, The.....Page 386
Strange: The Development of Creation on the Earth..... 747
Strange: The Legends of the Old Testament traced to their Primitive Sources..... 741
Stratton: Brought Home..... 195
Stretton: The Crew of the Dolphin..... 580
Sunday-School Literature, Our..... 824
Sunday-School Methods..... 388
Swinton: Bible Word-Book..... 386
Symbolism of the Pre-Christian Cross..... 612
Early Writers on the Cross..... 612
Significance of the Various Representations of the Cross—
The *Crux Ansata*, or Handle Cross..... 614
The *Nile Measure*, also the Maltese Cross 618
"Thor's Hammer," or "Thor's Battle-ax," 619
Crosses in Europe and in India..... 621
Crosses represented in "Grove" or "Mystic Palm-tree" of Eastern Nations... 622
Tau Cross..... 626

Taxation of Church Property..... 243
Side Issues disposed of..... 243
True Function of Government..... 246
Relation between Religion and the State.. 249
Right Rule of Taxation in General..... 251
Taylor: Diseases of Women, etc..... 374
Taylor: Paralysis and other Affections of the Nerves, etc..... 183
Tennyson: Queen Mary..... 756
Theological Faculties of Germany, The..... 153
Theological Medium, A Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly..... 580
Theologische Studien und Kritiken..... 150
359, 717, 718
Todd, John: The Story of his Life..... 196
Townsend: Lost Forever..... 180
True: John Winthrop and the Great Colony 196

Uhlhorn: Der Kampf des Christenthums mit dem Heidenthum, (The Contest of Christianity with Heathenism, etc.)..... 762
Universalist Quarterly..... 348

Vanderbilt University, Dedication and Inauguration of..... 385
Van Lennep: Bible Lands..... 371
Vincent: Through and Through the Tropics 386
Virginia, Fifth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of..... 386
Von Dollinger: Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches..... 178

Waddy: The Little Trowel..... 195
Wakeley: The Patriarch of One Hundred Years..... 195
Wakeley, the Wesleyan Demosthenes: Comprising Select Sermons of Rev. Joseph Beaumont, etc..... 191
Ward: History of the Cross..... 731
Warring: The Mosaic Account of Creation the Miracle of To-day, etc..... 189
Weeks: Jehovah-Jesus; the Oneness of God; the True Trinity..... 764
Wells: Robinson Crusoe's Money..... 387
Westminster Review..... 150, 331, 715
White's Book, "Life in Christ"..... 355, 357
Whitney: English Grammar..... 764
Whitney: The Life and Growth of Language 506
Wise: Summer Days on the Hudson..... 191
Woodbury: Easy Lessons in German..... 196
Wood: Methodism and the Centennial of American Independence..... 740
Wright: Principia; or, Basis of Social Science..... 580

Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte..... 536, 720
Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie, 535, 719

L 4581